STATE OF ALABAMA ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINES AND ENFORCEMENT MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA

IN RE: CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINES

PUBLIC HEARING

March 11, 2004

* * * * *

The following PUBLIC

HEARING was had and done before

the Advisory Committee on Child

Support Guidelines and Enforcement,

held on March 11, 2004, at the

Alabama Judicial Building, 300

Dexter Avenue, Montgomery,

Alabama, and transcribed from a

videotape by Laura A. Head, Court

Reporter.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT AT PUBLIC HEARING ON MARCH 11,

2 0 0 4

Honorable Lyn Stuart Associate Justice Supreme Court of Alabama 300 Dexter Avenue Montgomery, AL 36104

Honorable John B. Crawley Presiding Judge Alabama Court of Civil Appeals 300 Dexter Avenue Montgomery, AL 36104

Honorable Aubrey Ford, Jr.
District Court Judge, Macon County
101 E. Northside Street
Tuskegee, AL 36083

Honorable Mary C. Moore Circuit Court Clerk, Perry County Perry County Courthouse P. O. Box 505 Marion, AL 36756-0505 Ernestine S. Sapp, Esquire P. O. Box 830239 Tuskegee, AL 36083-0239

Tom Bernier
Director, Child Support Enforcement
Alabama Department of Human
Resources
Gordon Persons Building
50 N. Ripley Street
Montgomery, AL 36130

Jennifer Bush, Esquire
Staff Attorney, Legal Division
Alabama Department of Human
Resources
Gordon Persons Building
50 N. Ripley Street
Montgomery, AL 36130

James R. Blackston 6185 Highway 195 North Jasper, AL 35503-3409

Kelley Christian (for Bonnie Teague)

1 (Whereupon, the following 2 Public Hearing was had 3 with Videotape One

KIMBERLY SMITH: To start off, I'm a second wife. I married my husband; been together since 1994. And we have created our own family, which is considered subsequent children in this state and doesn't seem to be as important as firstborn children with the guidelines that the State of Alabama currently have.

beginning as follows:)

Child support guidelines for Alabama literally condemn the father who dares to marry again and to rear another child, while forcing a deadbeat dad to pay up and be completely appropriate and forcing a responsible father in this case into near bankruptcy to support one child, his first by his first marriage, leaving the second family constantly

struggling.

For instance, the guidelines state specifically that courts shall review income statements that fully disclose the financial status of the parties. Yet throughout my husband's long battle over child support, the exwife was never made to submit any documents to prove her financial status; however, we were forced to provide all of our information for them to look at.

Her word seemed to be law with the court, who presumed that she would not lie. The court presumed her veracity in the same way that the guidelines state:

The custodial parent shall be presumed to spend his or her share directly on the child. Yet the court presumed and assumed only in favor of the custodial parent suing for support.

There is no assumption in

favor of the parent obligated to pay support at exorbitant rates. For instance, in my case, even though we were fully able to prove payment of several years of child support, my husband's exwife simply claimed that she had not received that money. Even though we provided copies of the checks with her signature on them and the stamp from her bank where she endorsed those checks, we're being forced to pay that money back in arrears with interest because she simply stated, He must have gotten those checks himself. The court presumed that she was telling the truth when she denied having endorsed the checks and spent that money.

As a result, like I say, we are now repaying that money. Paying it twice. There was no attempt to verify the endorsement with her

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the truth of her claims. How can any family court rule in defiance of the evidence considered legal in any business, bank or even in a civil court? What more proof could we have provided than the endorsed checks and cashier's checks for which we had stubs and provided?

To worsen the matters, child support is computated upon his gross income, which in my case is relying heavily upon his overtime. Despite paying the taxes on the support funds, my husband cannot claim these expenses on his taxes. Despite that everything is computated upon gross income, it is paid out of his net income.

The guidelines need to make it clear that if the noncustodial parent provides fifty-one percent or more of the child support, then

that parent be given the right to claim that child for their tax deduction. Another possible solution would be to share the tax deduction in alternating years with the child.

A related problem in the computation of child support is the use of overtime to establish gross income. Child support figures are computed with overtime even though the overtime is not counted as steady income by businesses, banks or any other type of financial institution that you would go to. Businesses do not permit me to claim overtime as part of gross pay when I apply for a loan or my husband or apply for a mortgage or any other means.

But the custodial parent can use her guaranteed support income, the child support, as a reliable source of income on

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

which to secure a loan on her behalf, which she has already done. She was able to take her paperwork stating how much child support she would be receiving as a guaranteed source of income and purchase a brand new car, which she did with her very first check.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The brand new Dodge Durango she is now driving, at the expense of our exorbitant rate of child support, averaging around twentyeight thousand dollars for a vehicle, was needed on her behalf to replace her other car that was only three years old. There is certainly no coincidence that this car was purchased within days of her very new and improved child support check. After all, court papers indicated the monthly amount ordered sufficed for her to secure that loan.

Meanwhile, myself, I can't afford to repair the heater that is

broken in my car. I depend on my defrost system to heat my car so that my two-year-old is not too terribly cold when we have to go somewhere.

Another greatly unfair part of the guidelines concerns the health insurance payments. For the total insurance premium -- and this is a quote from the guidelines: The total insurance premium for family or dependant coverage, regardless of whether all children are covered, are in the same family.

How can it be fair and equitable for my husband to pay health insurance for the ex-wife's husband and child while we struggle to keep our own family insured? I can't imagine anything more absurd than paying money to an ex's new spouse and child.

My husband offered to cover

his child on his health insurance, which would have no more -which would not have raised his premium at all. This was denied.
We offered to pay the part of the premium that it would cost to cover his daughter only on insurance and not the entire family. This was denied.

The court refused that offer and then refused to entertain a request for -- to have his ex-wife's insurance company to calculate the cost for the one child. Instead, the court demanded that he pay to the ex-wife's total health insurance package claiming that any change to move those provisions would take away money from the mother. Perhaps then she wouldn't be able to go to Florida as many times as she does.

In a comment to the guidelines, it is clear that there

is to be both proof of the child enrollment and actual cost provided if a parent is forced to pay these premiums. We have never seen that proof or any specified information about cost.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Again, at no time in our legal battle was the ex-wife forced to turn over any papers related to actual costs, expenditures, and debts involving this child in question. We watched while she pulled figures from her head, which were then accepted by the court as the gospel truth. Our offers -- Our proof, whether cashed, endorsed checks or detailed financial statements were never good enough to override the legal presumption in her favor. Why do the guidelines presume that an ex-spouse receiving support never lies and the paying spouse never seems to tell the truth?

Adding insult to injury, my husband and I were told to consider bankruptcy, to sell our assets, any jewelry, any cars, any property, to be able to afford the increased amount of child support. My husband was also advised to get a second job so that he could afford to pay this child support; however, such a move would be another absurdity on his case. We would be right back in court again paying more child support because his income would then be up.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Our legal fees are higher than they ever needed to be because the ex threw up every obstacle conceivable, and quite a few that were inconceivable, to make our lives miserable. And she got a way with it because the presumptions in the guidelines are totally skewed in her favor.

It is nearly impossible to

rebut a presumption about the truth or falsity of any claim if generally accepted evidence is not weighed in the balance and considered by the court. But yet, again, because of presumptions, her evidence was gold and ours was lead. The Court's failure to properly consider our evidence has led to a denial of our due process, equal protection under the law. We never had a chance to be properly heard or to have our evidence considered.

Second families throughout
Alabama suffer a lack of equal
protection and a lack of equal
equity in all child support
matters. These guidelines
desperately need revision to
remove the heavy presumption of
the custodial parent, to create an
equitable environment for both
parents, and demand strict
accountability in the use of child

support payments, not just in the payment of them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In these days of strict accountability in all phases of government, it is inexcusable that the judicial system, upon which we all depend for impartial judgments and equitable treatment, has instituted one of the most unaccountable, inequitable, and unfair systems imaginable in this case of child support. It is time that the state recognized other children that are born second or third or fourth and that they still deserve the equal right to have their father support them as well as the first child. No child is more important than the other based on when their birthday is.

My daughter receives the same

-- deserves to receive the same

amount of support that her halfsister receives regardless of

1 where they live. And it is not 2 fair that the state does not 3 recognize my daughter as a child. 4 She is just as much his daughter 5 as his first child is, and she 6 deserves just as much consideration and rights to her 8 father as that first child does. 9 Thank you. 10 JUDGE GOSA: I expect some 11 can't hear in the back. They are 12 going to set up a mike so we can

get a system going here. If you have a copy of your remarks and want to leave them with the committee, please do so before you leave.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Has Debby Vann come in yet? Debby Vann? Cynthia Brothers?

We'll take just a second for them to get set up so everybody can hear.

(Brief pause.)

CYNTHIA BROTHERS: Our child support -- I'm from Shelby County, by the way. Our child support guidelines state -- and I quote -- Children should not be penalized as a result of the dissolution of the family unit but should continue to receive the same level of support that had been available to them -- I'm sorry. This is all coming back to me. I've lived it for the past nine months, and it's all coming back to back to me.

I quote: Children should not be penalized as a result of the dissolution of the family unit but should continue to receive the same level of support that would have been available to them had the family unit remained intact.

It amazes me that our guidelines do not want a child to be penalized on a monetary level, but the same consideration is not given for the emotional needs of the child. The child should get

the father's money but not the father's time, love, and guidance.

And this mentality is played out in our courts everyday.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I agree the children should not be penalized; however, our current guidelines do penalize children. They are called subsequent children.

Our guidelines state -- The guidelines also do not address the problem of subsequent children or families. No deduction may be made for children born or adopted after an initial award of support. This lack of consideration is wrong. And it's unfair to all the children that are unlucky enough to be born after a first child or adopted after a first child, which my opinion, an adopted child to deny that child the same consideration as a firstborn child is even worse because of what that child has already gone

through in its life.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is saying to all the subsequent children, You do not matter. These children cannot help their birth order and have the right to be equally supported by their father.

While another firstborn child is overcompensated, the man's other children do without braces, clothing, movies, birthday, and Christmas presents. I'm not saying they do completely without, but the father cannot provide for those children the way that he could because of the extraordinary percentage of his income is being paid to an exspouse. And in our case, it's an ex-spouse that she is the one that wanted the divorce. My husband tried to keep the marriage together, and there was at no fault of his that the divorce happened.

23

24

25

The man also cannot provide the same for his other children because he is ordered to pay to the ex-wife the extraordinary percentage of his monthly income, nor can a man provide the same for the firstborn in his home as the mother can in hers because he is paying such a large amount out child support to the mother. He doesn't have the money to spend the same kind of money in his home as she can in hers, which where -- in a child's eyes, where does that make the child want to live? How can we say one child deserves more than another?

Furthermore, the child support amount paid for a firstborn child and alimony paid to an ex-wife is deducted from a noncustodial parent's income before child support for a second child is calculated. Once again, all of the children are not treated

equally by these guidelines.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Section B, Paragraph 7 of Rule 32 guidelines addresses health insurance premiums. It requires the total insurance premium for family or dependant coverage to be added to the basic child support guidelines. This total insurance premium may cover children that are not the man's child and a spouse of his ex-wife that he still has to pay a percentage of that total insurance premium. Why is it we are making fathers pay for their exwife's husband and their children to be covered by insurance?

The Rule 32 guidelines

calculate child support based on gross income. This in itself increases the amount a noncustodial parent has to pay in that they do not receive the benefit of the gross but only the net to live on themselves.

1 The child support is not tax 2 deductible for the noncustodial 3 parent. And the custodial parent 4 does not have to claim -- a 5 custodial parent does not have to 6 claim the income and, at the same time, receives the tax exemption 8 for that child. You're hitting the 9 father three times right there.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm a firm believer that a child should be supported by both parents. While we spend millions of dollars in this nation tracking down what the courts call deadbeat dads, there is nothing done to insure the mothers are spending their portion of support on what they receive from the father on the children. There is no accountability for where the money is spent. We have seen that mothers go out -- in Kimberly's case -- and buy a brand new Dodge Durango the very month she gets an increase in

child support. That happens every day. It happened in my case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Women know going into a divorce that they will walk out of the courtroom with the children and a huge child support award because the courts in this state are biased towards the mothers. And me standing her, as a mother, I can still tell you that, because I have been through our system and I have personally seen it. I didn't -- I tried to deny it until I went through it. They are biased towards the mother. And I spoke to others, and I am convinced for whatever reason the judges feel that the mothers need the children and need an exorbitant amount of child support to raise that child.

In our case, my husband is paying six hundred and fifty dollars a month. That's one-

fourth of his income for one child. So her portion would be three fifty. Does it cost a thousand dollars a month to raise a child? No. So what is that? In my opinion, it's embedded alimony. And he is having to support his ex-wife that wanted a divorce from him. That's another slap in the face to that dad.

Our current guidelines are based on an income-shares model, which violates the equal protection standard by not treating the noncustodial parent equally. The income-shares model does not take into account that additional cost to the noncustodial parent during their periods of visitation with the child, costs such as clothes, food, entertainment, and haircuts. The child support should be based on the actual cost of raising a child and not how much money do

you make.

Since our guidelines were last amended over a decade ago, there has been extensive research done on cost-based guidelines. I have provided some of that in the handout that I gave you. And I ask that you consider that. There are better options for our child support guidelines.

This approach uses actual spending data on children to reflect out-of-pocket expenses and meet equal protection standards for the parents and the children. Income shares has built-in biases and leads to typical child support awards that are about double what they should be if based on professional economic standards.

I am asking that you strongly reconsider every aspect of our current guidelines and look at them in a light of how they are

really affecting families in Alabama. These current guidelines have affected my family and many others around me in a negative way. I understand the motives behind these current guidelines and that it is to protect the child, but there are more children to consider than just a firstborn child of a man.

As we all know, the divorce rate is high, which means the rate of second marriages is high. And in our case, we have been married for almost nine years, and we have two children in addition to our other son. We have always supported my stepson over and above the child support as much as we could, sending him to a private school so that he could have a good education. We paid for half of that. We paid for half of extracurricular activities. That was never considered when

1 we just went back to court. 2 was never considered that we have 3 been willing to over and above support this child. 4 5 All children are created equal and should be treated equal by 6 our court system. 8 Thank you. 9 JUDGE GOSA: Questions? 10 Thank you, ma'am. Debby Vann? 11 DEBBY VANN: Hi, I'm Debby 12 Vann, and I'm not a public 13 speaker either. So I'm going to read. I'm a grandmother. 14 15 JUDGE GOSA: Excuse me, Ms. 16 Vann. You weren't here earlier. 17 When eight minutes are up, I will alert you --18 19 MS. VANN: I won't take that 20 long. (Unintelligible.) 21 JUDGE GOSA: I want to give 22 you an alert so if you haven't 23 covered something you want to, 24 you can. What county are you

25

from?

JUDGE GOSA: Thank you.

MS. VANN: She already stated this before and previously that the children are penalized when, you know, their families are dissolved. And when there are both parents, they do need both parents, emotionally and financially.

In some cases, when shared physical custody is requested by one of the parents and the other parent will not agree to this, without legal counsel, the court in most cases has been known to grant physical custody to the parent that has legal counsel. In certain cases, the noncustodial parent will not be able to afford additional counsel to modify a child support obligation. Due to the lack of funds, without legal counsel, they are at the mercy of

the court.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There are insurance provisions when divorced. If the former spouse was covered on the custodial spouse's insurance, they must wait to be covered by his company on his company's anniversary date before he can be covered; therefore, he is without insurance. If he needs to seek medical attention or an accident was to happen, he would have to pay out of his pocket the full price of the coverage until he deemed be able to have insurance through his company. And that can be quite costly. But still, the former spouse can get fifty percent of his income, and that comes out first.

Then he -- He or she is having to provide the children or child with the basic needs on visitation, which is clothing, entertainment. If a medical need

arises and the spouse is not
there, if they have to go to the
doctor, yes, they pay half of
their medical costs for the
medication that children will -you know, are required to take.
They have to pay half of that out
of an income that they aren't
drawing but fifty percent of it.

It's costly for them to find a new home if they relinquish their home and -- for the benefit of the children where they will not be disrupted from their home. But they also have to have a place for their children to come to sleep and beds to sleep in, to start all over. And that is with fifty percent of their take-home.

They -- Also, they have to pay taxes on all this -- all their income even though half of their income is sent to pay child support.

And I believe that is really

1 all that I wanted to discuss and 2 say. And I just think that the 3 guidelines maybe could be worked 4 on a little bit to make it more 5 fair for the children to see both 6 parents and spend equal amounts of time. If there is more joint 8 physical custody, then the 9 guidelines may be would not be so 10 high. But most of the time, it is 11 granted to the female parent. 12 Thank you. 13 JUDGE GOSA: Any questions from the committee? Thank you, 14 15 ma'am. Do you have anything in 16 writing that you want to present to us? 17 18 MS. VANN: I did. 19 JUDGE GOSA: Okay. I'm 20 sorry. All right. James R. 21 Womack? JAMES R. WOMACK: Do you 22

JUDGE GOSA: Any time. Just whatever is convenient for you.

want a copy of my remarks now?

23

24

25

MR. WOMACK: I'll give it to you now. I've got a cold, and I'm nervous. I'll probably forget it after I speak.

JUDGE GOSA: Go ahead. Mr. Williams will get copies for all the committee members if you don't have enough copies.

MR. WOMACK: I commend these two ladies that just stood up and spoke. They did a good job. I hope I can do that well.

My name is Jim Womack. When you called James, that's my formal name. My mother calls me that when she's mad at me, but I haven't heard that in a long time.

I'm a fifth-year resident of Montgomery, Alabama. I moved here five years ago. I'm currently employed as a librarian at Faulkner University. My remarks do not reflect Faulkner's position on anything, okay? This is my personal remarks in my

experience with the divorce courts and the laws in the State of Alabama.

That was a mistake five years ago when I moved here because they had no-fault divorce laws.

So I got a divorce I didn't even want. But anyway, let's get on with why I'm here.

I would like to encourage this committee to consider changing the current child support laws where they examine the salaries of the spouse or former spouse of a divorcee. I don't know if I will (unintelligible) have everything read.

But my ex-spouse outearns me four thousand dollars annually.

She currently receives forty-three percent of my paycheck for, as

I've noted, over eight hundred and forty dollars a month. I failed to write down here -- I thought of this as the two ladies

were speaking. But whenever I pick my kids up every other weekend, if there's a medical bill that she has had, I'm liable for half of it, okay? Plus she gets forty-three dollars eighty-four cents for life insurance for those children. Everything she gets from me is tax free. I pay the taxes on all of it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I went to court last summer to get my child support payments reduced. That was a farce. Right now you can see that I'm in severe financial hardship. I have a good job. I have a good salary. But right now I am no better off than when I was a freshman working my way through library school.

And you see from my remarks I have a house that was built in the 1930's because, as you know, real estate in Montgomery is

25 expensive. (Unintelligible) people pay in rent, you could buy a house. It's not fancy, but it works. I drive a 1989 model car.

If it wasn't for the church that I attend -- They bought my kids' Christmas presents last year. I have no savings. When my car breaks down, the church pays my car repair bill. I have no back-up plan. I'm not allowed to work extra because if I do, my ex-spouse is entitled to those earnings.

What else.

Like I said, if it wasn't for a no-fault divorce law, I wouldn't be in this position. But right now, it's really uneven because my wife -- or former spouse is driving a brand new four-door Chevrolet truck. She still has the house that we purchased together five years ago here in Montgomery. I don't know who is making the payments on that.

Plus, she purchased a mobile

home where her kids -- where our

kids and she are living now.

They moved three hours from here
to a town called Chatom,

Alabama. Very rural area.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I went to court last year to get my child support payments reduced. Found out that the money I spent on child support for a year and a half was just free money for her and her mother's pleasure. The judge did give me some relief for two months. He stopped my child support, which helped me a little bit. But then when it resumed, it went up. Although I had a Wall Street article claiming that the economy in this country did not grow one percent last year, they got a cost of living raise. didn't.

I'll be happy to answer any questions you have. I understand

that kids need to be provided for.

The problem we have in America today is because of a few deadbeat dads. The rest of us have to pay the cost. All it takes is one American to ruin it for everybody.

I'm glad I live here. We live in the best place in the world.

But I think some laws need to be made fair. You just heard these ladies' tales.

You know, I have read articles in the New York Times, the L. A. Times. Child support drives men to poverty. Now, I believe my kids should be provided for, and I'm going to see that they're provided for. But it needs to be on equal terms. That's all I'm asking is for some equality.

Do you have any questions?

I'll be happy to answer any
questions.

JUDGE GOSA: Questions?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I have
a question.

MR. WOMACK: Yes, sir.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I'm

James Blackston from Birmingham,
the Noncustodial Parent

Representative. Was your child
support originally set by the
guidelines at the time of your
divorce?

MR. WOMACK: Yeah, that's what the judge said. I have not seen the guidelines. That's what my attorney said. That's what the judge said. And then the article I read that announced this meeting said that for a parent of two kids should only be paying six hundred and seventy-seven dollars a month, and you can see I'm paying well over that.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Did
your attorney inform you that
there was a thing called Alabama
Child Support Guidelines?

MR. WOMACK: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: And about how much is your child support in relation to your gross income?

MR. WOMACK: It's fortythree percent, if I did my math correctly.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: And then you pay the income taxes on top of that?

MR. WOMACK: And then, like I said, if there was a medical bill that she has had while she has while the kids are in her custody, when I pick them up every other weekend, she will give me the receipt, and I'm responsible for half of it.

I will say, right now I see my kids the first and third weekend of every month. I have been told they've been to the doctor twice in three weeks. You know, that happens.

I was supposed to see my kids
next weekend. Right now, I don't
have the money to go see them. I
will have to call her and say I
can't see them this weekend. I'm
not able to drive to Evergreen to
pick them up.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: So, basically, what you're saying is that child support, in one way or another, has at one time prevented you from seeing your children.

MR. WOMACK: Yes. I don't mind paying child support. Can you understand that? My kids need to be provided for. I understand that, and I will see to it that they are provided for. But we need some equality here.

And as the lady said a couple of minutes ago, you don't know what the ex-spouse is doing with the money that she receives. You know, like I say, when I went to

1	court last year, we found out that
2	it wasn't being used for child day
3	care. They were just spending it.
4	So there needs to be some kind of
5	provision of course, this is
6	going to add to everybody's
7	workload making sure they are
8	spending this money properly.
9	You know, all it takes is one
10	American to ruin it for
11	everybody.
12	Any other questions? I'm sure
13	I probably missed some things.
14	I'm nervous. I don't feel well.
15	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Why is
16	t h e
17	MR. WOMACK: Pardon me?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: When the child support was computed, was the child care expense being calculated? Were you paying the child care?

MR. WOMACK: Yes, she --What happened was, according to the judge's decision, she

1 overestimated the cost -- See, they moved to Chatom, Alabama, 2 3 three hours from here. I don't 4 know anything about that part of 5 the country. But she 6 overestimated the cost of the day care. So then when I went back 8 to court, the judge determined 9 that she grossly overstated the 10 cost of day care. And so what he 11 did, like I said, he stopped my 12 child support for two months to 13 help give me some relief. But, 14 you know, that was nice. It was 15 needed and it helped. You know, 16 I'm just like you. I work hard 17 forty hours a week. I pay my 18 debts.

I did -- I failed to mention
that I inherited my former
spouse's credit card bill. I got
it down to fifteen hundred
dollars. It was at one point
three thousand.

JUDGE GOSA: Any other

19

20

21

22

23

24

questions?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I have one. Are you saying that you pay more than the child support guidelines?

MR. WOMACK: Yes. Well, I don't know how much -- When they figured the guidelines, a certain percentage goes to day care, and I don't know what that percentage is. But she overestimated the cost of day care in that town. And the judge determined that she grossly overstated the cost, and so, like I say, he stopped the support for two months.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Judge Gosa --

JUDGE GOSA: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: -- I
would like to comment. You said
that -- I think that you have an
understanding that part of the
child support is figured for day

1	care in the guidelines?
2	MR. WOMACK: Yes.
3	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well,
4	that's not true.
5	MR. WOMACK: That's not
6	true?
7	COMMITTEE MEMBER: It's
8	not figured in the provision of
9	the guidelines. That's an add-on
10	after your support level should be
11	figured.
12	MR. WOMACK: Okay. Well
13	COMMITTEE MEMBER: There's
14	no provision for
15	MR. WOMACK: Child support?
16	COMMITTEE MEMBER: You
17	say that you pay them five
18	hundred dollars a month. There's
19	no provision in the guidelines
20	that attributed that five hundred
21	dollars as part of it being day
22	care.
23	COMMITTEE MEMBER: There
24	is a provision in the guidelines
25	for day care, but it's not in the

1 table. It's an add-on. 2 MR. WOMACK: I didn't know 3 that. I apologize. I'm a librarian. I should have read the 4 guidelines. I haven't seen them. 5 6 JUDGE GOSA: Thank you, sir. MR. WOMACK: Any other questions? 8 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER: One 10 other question. Did -- After the 11 two-month period that you got 12 some relief there, did the support 13 continue on that present level, or 14 were you allowed a modification 15 based on --16 MR. WOMACK: No. She got 17 an increase for cost of living 18 raise so -- I think it's in my letter here. Eight hundred and 19 20 seventy-one dollars tax free right 21 now. That's what it is now. 22 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Did 23 you appeal your case? MR. WOMACK: Pardon me? 24

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Did

you appeal that judge's decision?

MR. WOMACK: No, I didn't.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I've
got another question related to
that. You did not appeal it. Did
you feel like you could afford to
appeal, or was your attorney's fee
already excessive?

MR. WOMACK: No. A month after the judge made its decision, I drove down to the town where they are living, and I went to all the of the day care places to find out if my children had been there. This is probably something I should have done sooner. But, hey, I'm a nice guy. I work hard. I assume people are trusting and honest. Well, you can't do that in today's society. I found out my kids had not been to any day care in that town. And so I came back to town. I called my attorney. I found out -- I said, look, she's not -- those kids

haven't been to day care in a year. And he said, Well, we can get her in contempt of court. I said, Well, what's that going to cost. Well, that's going to cost another five hundred dollars attorney, court costs.

And I can't play the legal game. The money I spent to go to court originally I took out of my retirement account. I can't afford to do that. You know, I'm forty-seven years old. I've got -- Whatever I have in retirement, I've got to keep there. I can't play the legal game. You know, if I had O. J. Simpson's money, I would still be married. But I can't play the legal game.

You know, I'm really
dissatisfied with the judicial
system, not only here but in -It's not fair. And, you know,
laws are for crooks. They're not
for honest, hard-working people

```
1
      who are trying every day. You
2
      know, Congress doesn't represent
3
      me. You know, I write letters. I
      send them email.
4
         JUDGE GOSA: Thank you, sir.
5
         MR. WOMACK: Am I free to
6
      go because I have to go back to
8
      work?
         JUDGE GOSA: You're welcome
9
10
      to stay or whatever your pleasure.
         MR. WOMACK: I need to be
11
12
      back (unintelligible).
13
         JUDGE GOSA: Joyce Gardner
      Thomas? Joyce Gardner Thomas?
14
15
      Jeremy Wells? Phillip Lienert or
16
      Lienert.
17
         PHILLIP LIENERT: Yes, sir.
         JUDGE GOSA: Come up,
18
      please. I apologize if I
19
20
      mispronounced your name.
21
         MR. LIENERT: That's right.
22
      Phillip Lienert.
23
         JUDGE GOSA: Addressing the
24
      committee. If you have any
25
      handouts, if you will leave that
```

1 with us so we can look at that. 2 MR. LIENERT: I do. Can I 3 pass them out now? 4 JUDGE GOSA: Yes, sir, that will be fine. We'll go ahead and 5 6 pass them out. Now, I don't believe you were here. When you 8 have spoken eight minutes, I will 9 let you know so that you have two 10 more minutes in case there is something you haven't covered 11 12 that you want to. 13 MR. LIENERT: Okay, sir. JUDGE GOSA: Go ahead. 14 15 MR. LIENERT: Okay. Good 16 morning. My name is Phillip 17 Lienert. I live in Hoover, 18 Alabama. 19 Child support penalizes noncustodial parents. The child 20 21 support guidelines need to be 22 revised and decreased. Imputed 23 income can also figure 24 prominently into the child

support calculations. This often

gets abused and needs to be changed, also.

My ex-wife left our marriage with half of our savings and her inheritance. She also has income from her job. I, on the other hand, am unemployed, partly because I'm partially disabled. My only income is military retirement pay, which my ex-wife gets some of, plus I earn a small amount of interest on my remaining savings.

Nevertheless, my ex-wife petitioned the court to impute income to me. She paid an employment specialist a lot of money to testify and say how much he thought I could earn. As a result, the judge disregarded my disability. It's a disability verified by a document by the V. A., Veteran's Administration.

The judge also ignored my efforts, as I presented in court,

to seek employment. The judge called me voluntarily unemployed, to quote him. And the judge imputed to me income of two thousand five hundred dollars per month.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

By the way, these figures I'm about to present are on the handout that I just passed out for you to look over.

The judge also imputed to income on my assets at the rate of five percent annually. This is despite the fact that money market rates nowadays are about point five percent or, in other words, one-half of one percent. In other words, about one-tenth of the five percent that he imputed to me. The judge also did not even adjust for the tax that I'm going to have to pay on the five percent interest assuming I was actually earning five percent, which I'm not.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This tallied up to the staggering sum of six thousand and eighty-two dollars per month in total income or about seventythree thousand dollars per year, despite the fact that the actual amount of my income, the military retirement pay, is about twentytwo thousand dollars per year. The other fifty-one thousand dollars of the seventy-three thousand-dollar total that my child support obligation was based upon is imaginary money that I am not earning.

This resulted in a monthly child support liability for me of one thousand two hundred and thirty-four dollars per month.

This is based upon also having two children. We had two children.

That's fourteen thousand eight hundred dollars per year in child support obligation that I have

while my actual income is about twenty-two thousand. In other words, I'm expected to live on seven thousand two hundred dollars per year after I lost two thirds of my income in child support.

Now, let me repeat this. My income is about twenty-two thousand dollars. My obligation for child support is slightly over two thirds of that. I'm paying fourteen thousand eight hundred dollars per year in child support. I'm left with and am expected to live on seven thousand two hundred dollars per year.

In my situation, and in most divorce situations, the court makes the mother the banker. In other words, the fourteen thousand eight hundred dollars that my ex-wife is getting from me per year goes to her, and she decides how to spend it. Or more

precisely, she decides who to spend it on and if it gets spent at all.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In my case, I know that my exwife is spending less per year on our children than the fourteen thousand eight hundred dollars that she's getting from me. she's not only contributing none of her own funds or income towards the children, but she's literally pocketing some of the child support that she gets from me. That's why she was thrilled when I was imputed five percent in annual interest of my assets even though she was also imputed five percent on her assets.

The amount she allegedly contributes to the child support went up because of this, but in reality, the amount that I actually pay to her goes up. And, once again, she is then free to spend as little of it as she wants

and keep the rest for herself or spend it on herself.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So in summary, when courts allow a spouse to end a marriage contract with no questions asked and they usually award the mother with most or all of the custody of the children, it's bad enough. But when a noncustodial parent also has to pay too much in child support, it hurts co-parenting. It contributes to some men becoming deadbeat dads. The children and both parents, both co-parents, are ultimately hurt in the long run. This means also that society gets hurt.

So ladies and gentlemen, I'm asking you to please take measures to fix this. I ask and recommend that two things be done. Number one, the abuse of imputed income be brought to a complete and total stop. And, number two, that the levels of

1	child support should decrease
2	considerably by at least twenty-
3	five percent, in my opinion.
4	That's all I had to present.
5	Are there any questions for me?
6	JUDGE GOSA: Any questions?
7	Thank you, sir.
8	MR. LIENERT: Okay. Thank
9	you very much.
10	JUDGE GOSA: Alan Rusmisel?
11	Am I pronouncing that anywhere
12	near correct?
13	ALAN RUSMISEL: That's very
14	close. That's better than the TV
15	did, anyway.
16	My name is Alan Rusmisel. I
17	am an HVAC mechanic for a
18	living, and I'm the noncustodial
19	parent for two children.
20	Dr. Robert Williams is the
21	single-most recognized influence
22	in developing the income-shares
23	model of establishing child
24	support guidelines, which have

been adopted by the State of

Alabama and is specifically referenced in Rule 32 Alabama Child Support Guidelines.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Dr. Williams consulted with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Office of Child Support Enforcement from 1983 to 1990. During this time, he directed research and provided technical assistance for the federally-funded Child Support Guidelines Project. contributions resulted in drastic changes in legislation between the years between the years of 1984 and 1988, which resulted in dramatically higher child support obligations which, in effect, creates the likely possibility that a child support arrearage will occur.

In 1984, Dr. Williams started
Policy Studies Incorporated in
Denver, Colorado. In 1987,
Williams used his influence to

introduce a moder for the child
support called income shares now
used by the State of Alabama.
PSI's two main sources of revenue
is general guidelines development
consulting with states based upon
Williams' income-shares model
and, number two, is to provide
privatized child support
collections on which its company,
PSI, receives ten to thirty-two
percent of all collections.

PSI also receives large consulting fees from states, which are reimbursed to the states by the federal government. In 1996, Williams' company, PSI, accounted for more privatized state child support enforcement contracts that any other private company that held state

In mid 1997, PSI had some five hundred employees with over twenty-one million dollars in

revenues. In 2002, Policy

Studies Incorporated employed some one thousand employees and reported over one hundred million dollars in revenue.

The conflict of interest between Williams' influence on legislation, consulting, and child support enforcement should be obvious.

Alabama, which is a jointcustody-preference state by
statute, Article 7, Section 30-3150, Code of Alabama 1975, it
only stands to reason that a
decision by a judge to order joint
custody would be based on the
fact that both parents are going
to be involved with the children
after the divorce. The Alabama
Legislature and court are stating
that it is in the best interest of
the children to have both parents
involved after divorce.

Yet, the income-shares model

adopted by the State of Alabama, Rule 32, Section 30-3-155, Code of Alabama, is based on oval expenditures of intact families across the country with minimum state input. Federal law requires that all relevant costs of raising child in the state are to be taken into account by the state model used to develop child support obligation tables creating a rebuttable presumption. second involved parent's cost to sustain a second household is not being considered in the cost of raising children in this state.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The reality is that economic studies used in the development of child support obligation tables were not conducted in reference to child support and were never intended to be used in relation to child support. None of these studies has any measure that federal law says should be used

in the states, and this is to fully consider the financial impact of both parents to continue to provide for their children in two entirely separate households.

The United States Bureau of

Labor Statistics gathers the baseexpenditure data used in the
income-shares model produced by

Dr. Williams. They actually
cautioned against the use of such
generalized data to apply to any
individual situation. This is
exactly what's occurring in

Alabama.

The income-shares model is currently being used in Alabama. As stated before, this model was developed by Dr. Robert Williams in 1987 and was presented in his report, Development of Guidelines for Child Support Orders:

Advisory Panel Recommendations and Final Report.

In 1988, Congress passed the

Family Support Act of 1988, which mandated presumptive rather than advisory child support guidelines. The states were only given a year to do so. It appears that Alabama, due to the short deadline required to comply with the new law, conveniently opted for the model proposed by the agency overseeing the whole program, the income-shares model.

In 1994, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services published Child Support

Guidelines: The Next Generation, in which Dr. Williams describes his model: The income-shares model is based on the concept that a child should receive the same proportion of parental income that he or she would receive if the parents lived together. A basic child support obligation is computed based on

1 combined income of the parents, 2 replicating total income of an 3 intact family. The basic 4 obligation comes from a table, 5 which is derived from economic 6 estimates of child-rearing expenditures minus average 8 amounts of health insurance, 9 child care, child's extraordinary 10 medical expenses. The basic 11 child support obligation is 12 divided between the parents in 13 proportion to their relative 14 income. Prorated shares of child 15 care and extraordinary medical 16 expenses are added to each 17 parent's obligation. If one 18 parent has custody, the amount 19 for that parent is presumed to be 20 spent directly on the child. For 21 the noncustodial parent, the 22 calculated amount establishes the 23 level of child support.

Items for the panel to keep in

mind: The model was based on

24

the concept that the child should receive the same proportion of parental income that he or she would theoretically receive if the parents lived together. It is designed to theoretically replicate total income in an intact household. No consideration is provided for the reality of additional expenses that occur in an involved second parent's household, which is necessitated by the simple and obvious fact that the parents no longer live together. Only one household matters.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Health insurance, child care, extraordinary medical expenses are typically added on to the obligation after the basic amount is calculated. The one parent with sole or primary custody receives the child support payment, and it is presumed that the money is spent directly on the

1	child. No accountability,
2	something that occurs in virtually
3	all other financial trust
4	situations, which child support
5	certainly is, is required from the
6	receiving parent. The full weight
7	of local, state, and federal law,
8	however, insures the
9	accountability of the obligor to
10	pay the obligee.

Federal law requires that the awards determined by this application of child support guidelines be rebuttable. It specifies that a written finding or specific finding on the record that the application of the guidelines would be unjust or inappropriate in a particular case

JUDGE GOSA: Two minutes,

Mr. Rusmisel. Two minutes.

MR. RUSMISEL: -- determined under criteria as established by the state shall be sufficient to

rebut the presumption in the case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And it further specifies that guidelines shall be reviewed every four years to insure that their application results in the determination of appropriate child support award amounts. So the table values established within the guidelines are presumed to accurately reflect the situation of parents and their children at various income levels. In theory, at least, federal law enables parents the possibility of pointing out to the court why the guideline numbers should not apply to their particular case, rebutting the presumption. Alabama, practice and theory are very, very different.

Economic studies used in the income-shares model are based on total family expenditures in intact families. There are estimates of spending that might

1 occur if the parents were living 2 together sharing all the expenses 3 of a single household. Spending 4 on children in separate 5 households has random 6 relationship to the combined income of parents. The income of 8 both parents can be appropriately 9 considered in the award decision 10 only if that consideration is 11 consistent with the fact that the 12 parents do not live together and, 13 therefore, do not use their income 14 jointly. Joint income and table 15 values related to joint income 16 have no relationship at all to 17 family economic circumstances in 18 the context of child support 19 award decisions. Without an 20 explicit and clear conceptual 21 basis for the award, a parent 22 attempting to rebut the 23 presumptive amount on the basis 24 that it is unjust or inappropriate 25 must do so without knowing what

1 just and appropriate is. The only 2 way to properly apply 3 mathematical decision models within the context of 4 constitutional justice is to fully 5 6 disclose the nature of the mathematics --8 JUDGE GOSA: Time. 9 MR. RUSMISEL: -- the 10 underlying reasoning, and the 11 assumption in such a way as to 12 make their review practical in 13 comparison with the circumstances of each case. 14 15 JUDGE GOSA: Your time has 16 expired. Do you have anything 17 else in writing that you want to 18 submit to us for us to look at? 19 MR. RUSMISEL: Yes, sir. 20 JUDGE GOSA: Okay. We'll 21 make copies for all the committee 22 members. 23 MR. RUSMISEL: I have 24 nineteen copies.

JUDGE GOSA: Any questions

1 for him before he sits down? 2 COMMITTEE MEMBER: What 3 county are you from? 4 MR. RUSMISEL: Jefferson. 5 JUDGE GOSA: Thank you, sir. 6 Joyce Gardner-Thomas? Jeremy W e 1 1 s ? 8 Mr. Wells, I'm not sure you 9 were here. When you've taken 10 eight minutes, I will give you a 11 two-minute alert so you will know 12 to cover anything you want to 13 cover. JEREMY WELLS: Yes, sir. 14 15 Thank you for having me here 16 today. I hope you can hear me. I'm kind of out of breath. 17 The 18 (inaudible) are down and it took us a while to find a parking spot. 19 20 I didn't know this was going 21 be as formal as it is, and I 22 only had a couple of hours to 23 prepare for it. 24 And I'm here today because,

you know, I have -- Really, I

nave three concerns, and 1 m
speaking from personal
experience. You know, I just
think it's Most of the time,
when children are awarded
custody to either parent, most of
the time, it's the mother. So
most often she's going to be the
custodial parent, and the father
is going to be the noncustodial
parent.

It's my belief -- and like I said, this is from my own personal experience -- the one parent or the custodial parent can often claim that the noncustodial parent has not or doesn't provide support for the children. They often understate income to gain more income -- excuse me, more child support for themselves.

And I have issues of how the guidelines are administered.

From my own personal experience in 2002, I filed a

petition for custody of my children. And, you know, I'm not a lawyer, and I don't know all the legal terminology that you use throughout the process. But in essence, I guess I sued her for custody of my children, and she counter-sued me.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And when she did that, she claimed that I never provided support for my children. Also, she asked for two years' back child support like I had never been there, I had never done anything for my children. And if I hadn't documented everything the way I had done, which I kept copies of my records and receipts and everything that I had done for my children, she probably would have gotten two years' back child support and, you know, cast a bad light on me like I'm a bad father.

During that time, my children

were in private school, and all the day care money, all the clothes, medical bills, health insurance, everything, I'm doing. Pretty much, the only thing that she was doing for me was babysitting for the kids. I work full time. I go to school full time. I'm graduating this December. But when we go to court, I'm made out to be the bad guy.

Like I said, you have copies of everything that I've done for my children, and if I hadn't kept these receipts and the documents and things the way that I have -- that I did, she would gotten two years' back child support. Also, you have a copy of the form used to determine who pays child support and how much is paid, the child support guidelines.

And I have no problem with paying child support. I believe

that any man or parent is obligated to pay, to take care of their children to the best of their ability. But, you know, it kind of adds insult to injury that once they calculate how much I'm supposed to pay in child support, they can't even do the math. I'm paying eighteen dollars more a month than I should have to be paying. And I'm not going to complain or cry over eighteen dollars because I would give it to my children anyway. But the attitude of the court is, you know, in a sense, you know, you're kind of a -- you're a deadbeat dad anyway from even being down here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So those are my complaints.

Those are my concerns, and that's why I came here. Again, I appreciate you giving me the time to voice my opinion and my concerns. And, again, I

1 apologize. I didn't know this was going to be as formal as it 2 3 is. But, you know, that's what I had to say today. 4 JUDGE GOSA: Any questions? 5 6 Thank you, sir. MR. WELLS: Thank you. JUDGE GOSA: Michelle Jones? 8 9 Michelle Jones? Edward Pickett? 10 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Ms. Jones is here. 11 12 JUDGE GOSA: Oh, I'm sorry. Come on up. I didn't see you. 13 MICHELLE JONES: I'm so 14 15 short. 16 Good morning. My name is Michelle Jones, and I'm a thirty-17 18 one-year-old mother of a fiveyear-old little girl. 19 20 I'm college-educated, moral, 21 and law abiding. I have a 22 successful career in journalism. 23 I have never done drugs or smoked a cigarette. I have no 24

mental illness, and I am a good

25

mother. But I am also a noncustodial parent.

In 1999, I made the singlemost important and now the
single-worst decision of my life.
I divorced a divorce attorney in
Covington County and agreed to
give my ex-husband physical
custody of my daughter. And if
you think the system is weighted
toward the woman, wait until you
go against a well-connected man
with deep pockets.

Every month I pay more than five hundred dollars in child support to an ex-husband whose household income I know exceeds a hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year. Every year, I have watched him buy forty-thousand-dollar cars, expensive jewelry, and take vacations in Hawaii and the Caribbean.

In exchange for that, I am allotted about fifty-six days per

year with my only child, and that's if I'm very, very lucky and very, very good. That is if I don't anger my ex-husband within my shared joint custody.

Just last night, my ex-husband told me he was going to refuse my visitation if I could not pick up my child within a thirty-minute window on Friday night or if I would not give up part of my upcoming weekend so that he could leave for vacation early.

After being divorced for five years, I got remarried in November. But if I hadn't, I probably would have had to have declared bankruptcy and move back in with my mother because I could no longer afford to pay for the two-bedroom apartment I needed for me and my child and still meet my child support obligation.

And now my new husband and I

pay more than eleven hundred dollars per month in child support, each of us to support one child. It is such a burden that we cannot afford to have our own child and continue to pay the attorney's fees that I have to pay to fight my ex-husband. What you are looking at is a mother without a child.

While my husband and I both agree that child support is necessary and should be enforced, we both question a system that can raise child support payments to those who need it as the state child support system often does. And we question the burden it places upon second families who suffer for the sake of the original family.

In the past five years, my mother and I have spent almost ten thousand dollars to defend the miniscule rights the State of

Alabama assigns noncustodial parents, and that doesn't include the six thousand dollars plus twelve percent interest I was ordered to pay in back child support for a period of time that I was under no official child support order but during which I supported my child financially. I believe this was assessed by the judge angry at me for fighting my ex-husband. And, incidentally, this judge and my ex-husband attend the same country club and the same church.

In 2002, I filed contempt charges against my ex-husband for interfering with visitation and asked the judge for more time with my daughter. Witnesses testified that my ex-husband had done everything from refusing to answer the phone when I called to refusing to allow me to pick her up for visits whenever he felt

like it.

I have never been consulted about her medical care, and I am barred from communicating with her school by him. And just before her fifth birthday last year, my ex-husband cancelled the birthday party I had planned to give her by telling her teachers not to pass out the invitations that I had sent.

The judge ignored all of this and said that my job, which I am an editor at the Montgomery Advertiser, and a handful of speeding tickets I got three years ago were reason enough to deny me any additional visitation. He gave me just three days extra in June, and he never even addressed the contempt charges. And I have no more money to appeal the ruling. It would have cost me ten thousand dollars just to appeal.

The state certainly doesn't

mind collecting child support

from that job but holds it against

me for visitation. I can't keep

my own child because I have a

full-time job, but I can't reduce

my hours because I must support

my child in the way the state

declares fit. Meanwhile, if I am

even late with a child support

payment, my ex-husband can put

me in jail.

Court hearings, phone calls from lawyers, and pleading with sheriff deputies to help me pick up my daughter have done nothing to stop my ex-husband from using the laws of the state against me. And still he doesn't stop.

More recently, I will have paid two thousand dollars in attorney's fees to defend against false allegations of sexual abuse made by my ex-husband against my current husband. He simply did not want my daughter to have a

stepfather.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Why does my ex-husband do all this? Because he can, and because the State of Alabama won't stop him. In other states, the false allegation of sexual abuse is grounds for a change in custody, but not in Alabama.

This is a picture of my child on her first day of ballet. I was there only because the ballet school tipped me off to her being there. It's one of the few occasions where I have been present for an important day in my child's life. In the five years since I was divorced, I have missed four birthday parties, her first steps, her first day of kindergarten, every haircut she's ever had except her first one, her first loose tooth, and her first soccer game.

Is it because I don't want to be there, because I haven't fought

to be there? No. It's because
the state pays lip service to
giving noncustodial parents equal
rights but does not enforce it.
Apparently, I could spend ten
thousand more dollars to file
contempt charges, but that would
do no good.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This issue is not about father's rights, and it isn't about mother's rights. It's about the rights of noncustodial parents to actually parent their children, and it's about the right of the child to be loved by the both parents. The balance of power between custodial and noncustodial parents must be equal, and it must be shared. Joint custody must be the default custody arrangement, and it must be shared as close to fifty-fifty as possible. Noncustodial parents need a simpler right to enforce their rights, one that

will not break them financially.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In 1999, when I divorced my ex-husband, I was an eightdollar-an-hour newspaper reporter with a ten-month-old daughter and no money. I signed papers agreeing to joint custody with my husband being the primary physical custodian. I did it to protect two families from an ugly legal battle I couldn't pay for and to protect my daughter from two warring parents. I did not do it to relinquish my rights. I had lost my own father in my parents' divorce, and I couldn't bear to watch it happen to my own daughter. And the irony is that now she has a father, but she doesn't have her mother.

In three days, my daughter
will turn six, and I will not be
there again. How many more
birthdays will I have to miss
before the state makes the rights

of noncustodial parents just as important as collecting child support? The only rights that I have and that other noncustodial parents have are those that are explicitly defined by the state.

We cannot count on our exspouses to do the right thing, and we cannot bear any longer to be a paycheck instead of a parent.

And I think I speak for all noncustodial parents when I ask:
Is this the message the state intends to send to noncustodial parents and our families? We want your money, but we don't want you.

JUDGE GOSA: Any questions from the committee?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I have a question. Would you say that because of your situation, being a noncustodial mother, that child support at that level that you have to pay or whatever has

prevented you from being a mother to your child?

MS. JONES: I don't think the level has prevented me from being a mother to my child. I'll pay whatever the state asks me to pay. I don't think the amount that I pay is fair. I believe my ex-husband makes more than he has been compelled to prove that he makes. I can still be a mother to my child. I just can't parent her, and I can't have my own child because of this.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Did
you -- Was the child support
guidelines worked out in your
case?

MS. JONES: Allegedly. But what I just found out in here is that day care is not supposed to be considered, which it was in my case. And my child doesn't even consider-- doesn't even attend day care.

1	COMMITTEE MEMBER: That's
2	not correct. That's not true.
3	COMMITTEE MEMBER: The
4	guideline tables do not consider
5	that at all specifically. It's in a
6	different portion of the
7	MS. JONES: The guidelines
8	used
9	COMMITTEE MEMBER: I don't
10	know what was used in your case.
11	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well,
12	that was my question. At the
13	time you made more than your
14	husband?
15	MS. JONES: No. My husband
16	makes considerably more than I
17	do. He's a practicing attorney
18	with a private practice in
19	Covington County.
20	COMMITTEE MEMBER: But
21	you're saying the guidelines were
22	used to come up with your share
23	
24	MS. JONES: Right.
25	COMMITTEE MEMBER: for

the support of the children. The other question I had was you said that the false allegations of sexual abuse against a parent usually gives custody to the other parent. When you say false, was there a report? Was there some

MS. JONES: My case --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: -court determination that the
allegations were false?

MS. JONES: Well, my case was investigated by two separate agencies. My husband has been completely cleared. He has never even been alone with my child.

And there is still a restraining order against my current husband because my ex-husband will not drop the restraining order. So we're still before the court on that.

JUDGE GOSA: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.

We didn't schedule a break this morning because we had so many presenters. We're running a little ahead of time. We'll take a ten-minute break. Let's be back into position in ten minutes. (Whereupon, a brief recess was had, after which Videotape One was

Videotape One was
restarted with a speaker
already in progress as
follows:)

EDWARD A. PICKETT: -recognition in the form of
financial relief. I would like to
encourage you to support a
program that would allow parents
paying child support to pay it on
a pre-taxed basis; that is, pay the
money for child support out of
our gross income before we pay
taxes.

In a lot of cases, there are companies that have pre-taxed or flexible savings type accounts

that they set up for things like anticipated medical expenses or child care. And in a lot of cases, these could be utilized.

Now, child support, as you know, is calculated based on parents' gross income. We currently pay taxes on this gross income and then pay child support out of our net incomes when the child support goes to the recipient who does not claim it as income or pay taxes.

And at this point, I ask you not to just dismiss me as simply another embittered deadbeat. But not taxing the amount that we pay for child support, it would not take any money away. It would not reduce the amount of money going to the custodial parent for the support of the child. It would, however, provide some financial benefit. Now, this is at the state level I'm talking about.

This savings would allow the noncustodial parent to better provide for the children while they're in their care.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I've done a little elementary attachment there on the back. And forgive -- Like I say, forgive my elementary presentation there. But the noncustodial parent making a gross income of fifty thousand pays two thousand four hundred and sixty-three dollars in income tax. Over there on the right you see if you do not tax the amount that -- They are paying nine hundred -- The custodial parent paying nine hundred dollars a month, that's ten thousand eight hundred a year. If you do not tax that part, that leave a taxable gross income of thirty-nine thousand two hundred dollars. And the tax on that, the Alabama state taxes -- income tax is one

thousand nine hundred twenty-three. That's an annual savings of five hundred forty-dollars, which is, I mean, not great, but it's a little bit. And noncustodial parents could use that, put it in a college fund or take a family trip, something to just -- a little something.

This would also help to ease the bitterness of disenfranchisement and promote a better relationship between custodial parents.

And I apologize. On some of this other, I don't have any documentation or data to support it. I'd just like for you to hear me.

I would also like to encourage
you to support a plan of
accountability for child support
recipients. Recipients are
currently not required to account

Tornow they spend the money.
Such a plan might require
quarterly reports to the
noncustodial parent about how the
recipient spends the money and
documented by appropriate
receipts. Such a plan would do
much to ease feelings of
bitterness and may perhaps
curtail incidents of domestic
abuse brought on by frustration.

And, finally, I would like to encourage you to consider an incentive plan for delinquent payers, a back payment amnesty program for so-called deadbeat parents. Under this proposal, parents that are excessively behind in their support payments who qualify to have their delinquent amounts forgiven and names cleared -- and this is excessive amounts that in many cases the excessive amounts are unreasonable to ever expect to

ever collect. But in order to get them to start paying, you could offer this amnesty program. And to qualify, the delinquent payers would have to start paying, not miss a payment, remain employed, and have no bad dealings with the law. And I anticipate this would be a more productive incentive and more positive alternative than some of the embarrassing approaches that have been taken in the past. I would urge you to consider it.

Thank you once again, ladies and gentlemen. And you're charged with a very important duty. You have the power to fashion the guidelines into a fair and equitable arrangement that is manageable by all or, to borrow from Winston Churchill, a monstrous tyranny unsurpassed in the dark and lamentable catalogue of human crime. I encourage you

1 to do the former.

Thank you very much.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I have one question, kind of just for clarification of your first proposal.

MR. PICKETT: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Are
you proposing to have the
Department of Revenue collect the
child support? How was that to
work?

MR. PICKETT: Well, now, once again, I've -- I'm afraid I'm just a -- I just came up with the idea, and I'm still working on the other part.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well, I say that because there was a proposal several years ago when the child support program came about, rather than having the (inaudible) of the courts, once the child support is decided, that it be collected by the Internal

Revenue Service because they

(inaudible). But it appears from

your first proposal that the

Department of Revenue would

collect the support and then apply

the taxable amounts after that

support has been deducted from

the gross income. Is that

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PICKETT: Yes. I'm not sure if the Department of Revenue could collect it or not. I know there are currently programs defer taxes on items such as child care. We have an account where I work, if you anticipate a certain amount for the year in child daycare, you can remove that amount from your gross pay and put it into a nontaxable account and pay -- and I don't know who administers or manages that. afraid I'm lacking on some of my research.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I may

1	have misunderstood you. I
2	thought you were abdicating a
3	deduction for child support
4	payments on your state income
5	taxes.
6	COMMITTEE MEMBER: No,
7	pre-taxed.
8	COMMITTEE MEMBER: I
9	believe he's making the
10	presentation.
11	MR. PICKETT: And we would
12	like that, too.
13	COMMITTEE MEMBER: We
14	have no authority on that. The
15	legislature has to pass those
16	laws. You may want to talk to
17	your legislator or state senator
18	about that. I understood you to
19	be saying that you thought child
20	support should be a deductible
21	item for income tax purposes.
22	MR. PICKETT: Well, I'm
23	sorry I didn't make that clear.
24	JUDGE GOSA: Any other

questions?

COMMITTEE MEMBER:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Basically, I think I'm in the same situation he is in that my employer deducts health insurance premiums and all, and you pay for it pre-taxed. So it comes off the top of your gross income, and that's what he's suggesting here in that it gives you, you know, a little break on your premium -- I mean your health insurance premium or your child care premium (inaudible). And I think the way -- It basically would be up to the -- I'm not sure if the tax -- what it would take to set it up with the state.

But your employer would still continue to send your child support payment to the state the way it does now. The only thing it would affect would be if it comes out pre-taxed, which in essence would be an offset towards using net income rather

than gross income.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Which is another way of saying it would be a tax exemption, and we don't have any authority over that.

Either the State Legislature or the Federal Congress would have to crank that into the Internal Revenue Code or the State

Revenue Code.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: When you say pre-taxed, is that tax deferred?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: No, sir, it's not. You don't pay income -- you don't pay taxes on the -- Just like my hospital insurance, that comes off the top of the line. Then after -- Say you've got a thousand dollars a month income and your hospital insurance is a hundred dollars a month, they take that and the company pays -- I mean, it comes out being untaxed federally and

	9
1	state on nine hundred dollars a
2	month. You know, so you pay
3	And there may be some guidelines
4	that are set up where the federal
5	government or the state or
6	whoever has said these things are
7	eligible.
8	(Whereupon, several people
9	began talking
10	simultaneously.)
11	COMMITTEE MEMBER: And

COMMITTEE MEMBER: And that's what you're saying is that we would have to get that approved through the legislature to do that.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Or
Congress if you want to do it at
the federal level, which you get
more relief there than you would
at the state level.

JUDGE GOSA: Thank you, sir.

MR. PICKETT: Well, thank

you very much. And, again, I

understand it's outside of your

control, but if you hear of it

somewhere down the road -- And understand that it's not -- it doesn't take money away from anybody except maybe the state and federal. It doesn't take any money away from the custodial parent or the child. And if you hear about it somewhere down the road, I ask you to support it. Thank you.

JUDGE GOSA: Let me see if
this other party is here, if you
don't mind. Joyce GardnerThomas? Mr. Blackston, I believe
you're next.

JAMES R. BLACKSTON: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for being here. I'm a noncustodial parent as well as a member of this committee. And I want the noncustodial parents in this room to understand that I represent their interests.

I hope this committee hears the pain expressed by these

noncustodial parents here today
by an unreasonable child support
system. Clearly, some relief
must be given to the noncustodial
parents. Sanctions alone will not
work. A new strategy is due for
Alabama's noncustodial parents.

Not all dads and moms who do not pay child support are deadbeats. Some lack the financial resources to pay mandated child support. Low income fathers face as many failures as welfare mothers do.

They're just low income poor (unintelligible).

I want to talk about the PSI because that's the proposal that seems to be paramount in everybody's mind. That's the only proposal we have to discuss, the one that's more or less being shoved down our throats.

Rather than base Alabama
Child Support Guidelines on

principles, Policy Studies uses an outdated cliché to overestimate the child support schedule that is the basis of Alabama's child support guidelines. The old cliché that children of divorce should enjoy the same standard of living as children in intact families has no basis in the federal law child support guideline review process.

Policy Studies compares
apples and oranges in their study
and actually admits it is a wellknown fact that single parents
have less money than intact
families. Policy Studies knows
that single-parent households
have less money to spend than
intact families, yet insists on
basing their study on intact
families.

The Advisory Committee must establish guidelines to take low

income fathers and mothers and unemployed obligators into consideration. The committee must ensure the guidelines allow parents with a low income to meet their needs after their child support is paid.

Policy Studies' latest

proposal seeks to increase the table by as much as thirty-two percent. How many of you in here could withstand a thirty-two percent decrease in your net income? I don't believe a one of you. I certainly couldn't.

For a family earning fifteen
thousand dollars, the increase
equals twenty-four percent. For a
family earning thirty-six
thousand, the increase equals
thirty-two percent. For a worker
that is earning minimum wage,
five dollars and fifteen cents an
hour, his increase under this PSI
proposal will be twenty-seven

point three percent on top of what he is already paying.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Policy Studies uses data from the Consumer Expenditure Survey to establish and update the Alabama Child Support Guidelines. I wrote to the Bureau of Labor Statistics to find out just where this data comes from, and I found out something that was very shocking. I asked the question how this survey was conducted and where the survey was conducted. Mr. Mike Wald, a Regional Economist from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, answered that, and he explained how the survey was collected from different families and where this data came from. And I specifically asked him was any of this data coming from Alabama.

His answer was: Regarding
your question about Alabama, CEX
collects data from certainty and

non-certainty areas to target -
Survey targets twenty-nine

certainty areas, metropolitan

statistical areas with a

population of more than one point

two million. As it happens, none

of this data came from Alabama.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Do you hear me? Alabama is -- PSI is attempting to establish guidelines for Alabama's noncustodial parents from data that does not even come from Alabama. The data actually comes from states like Georgia and Florida and the big metropolitan areas of Atlanta and larger cities of Florida. No consideration is given to the number of sampled areas in any one given state. Any data on non-certainty areas would be insufficient to provide information to base child support guidelines on.

Policy Studies' proposal is based upon false assumptions,

incorrect and inadequate CEX data from states other than Alabama and results in an arbitrary and capricious gauge that fails in every respect to comply with the federal child support guidelines laws, Federal Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 302.56, specifically Paragraph H.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There are three categories of noncustodial fathers in this Those that can pay on time state: and do, and those that cannot pay, and simply others that just can't afford to pay. What should be done about noncustodial parents who have a limited ability to pay? A new child support strategy -- enforcement strategy is long overdue in Alabama. We know that most parents are non -- are low income. The ones that are subject to paying child support

just simply cannot pay.

1 The child support guidelines, 2 including Policy Studies 3 Incorporated's latest proposal, would drive a wedge between 4 5 noncustodial parents and their 6 children by not recognizing the non-cash support that 8 noncustodial parents provide 9 every time that the child is in his 10 or her home. This policy runs 11 counter to the practice of most 12 low-income communities of 13 accepting in-kind contributions 14 of food, clothing, toys, et cetera, 15 in lieu of financial 16 contributions. Policy Studies' 17 guidelines proposal makes no 18 provision for in-kind 19 contributions by the noncustodial 20 parent. 21

Alabama's child support

guidelines, including PSI's latest

proposal, does not account for

parenting-time adjustment. We

must include a parenting-time

22

23

24

25

adjustment in our new guidelines.

Alabama's child support
guidelines, including Policy
Studies' latest proposal, would
drive a wedge between the
noncustodial parents because it
does not consider situations of
joint physical custody and
actually is in conflict with
Alabama's new joint custody law.
We need a new child support
worksheet that involves figuring
child support on those cases of
joint and shared physical
custody.

Presently, Alabama's child support guidelines do not take into consideration income withholding nor child support overpayments nor the termination of income withholding. That is something that is mandated by the federal government. For Alabama being -- complying with federal law, we must consider income

withholding and termination of income withholding.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Alabama Child Support Guidelines, including Policy Studies' latest proposal, does n o t define what child support is. W e need a system, similar to what the State of Georgia recently passed that became effective in January of this year, of issuing debit cards to the custodial parent. Debit cards would serve two purposes. It will give the noncustodial parent an accounting of how his child support is being used and, also, it will save the state money in the disbursement unit.

Alabama's child support
guidelines, including Policy
Studies' proposal, will drive
another wedge between
noncustodial parents and their
children by failing to calculate
child support in third-party cases

as well as children of second families. You've heard a lot of testimony here today about children of second families. They are totally not considered. They are evidently as non-citizens of Alabama. To do their job properly as this Child Support Committee, we must consider children of second families.

Alabama's child support
guidelines presently drive a
wedge between noncustodial
parents and their children and
Policy Studies Incorporated
proposal will further drive that
wedge because of overestimation
of income based on default orders
for one reason or another. And
you've heard testimony on that
issue here today.

Unfortunately, we have case
law in this state that says you
cannot forgive arrearages in child

support. But, regardless,
arrearages, retroactive
assignment of child support to
the date that the divorce was
filed, is discriminatory against
the noncustodial parent and is
immorally wrong.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Alabama's child support guidelines and PSI's latest proposal will drive a wedge between noncustodial parents by making modifications difficult. For the noncustodial parents in here, I want them to realize that if they do not get help from DHR in adjusting their child support modifications, they can file a complaint with the federal people in Atlanta, and I'll give you the information on how to file that The State of Alabama has report. already been reported to the state -- to the Federal Administration for Children and Families because the Department of Human

1 Resources refuses to help 2 noncustodial parents when it 3 comes to child support 4 modification. 5 JUDGE GOSA: Time's up. MR. BLACKSTON: Is that it? 6 Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. 8 JUDGE GOSA: Bridges D. 9 Anderson? Come on up, please, 10 sir. COMMITTEE MEMBER: Mr. 11 12 Blackston, what county are you 13 from? 14 MR. BLACKSTON: I got a 15 divorce in Walker County. I'm 16 presently living with my beautiful second wife in Jefferson 17 18 County. It took me fourteen 19 years to find her after I went 20 through the divorce. 21 By the way, I no longer pay 22 child support. I'm over that. 23 All my children are grown. And 24 the state owes me twenty-two

hundred dollars in overpayment,

25

which they refuse to pay. So who is the real deadbeat here? The State of Alabama.

BRIDGES D. ANDERSON: Good morning. I'm Bridges Anderson.

I'm just here to present some evidence concerning my situation

in reference to child support.

JUDGE GOSA: All right, sir.

Several years ago, I stepped out of my marriage and had an affair with a married woman as well. And what happened in that situation, it went to court, and she charged me with child support.

In reference to that, I was paying the largest amount for child support, sixty-one percent of that. And it goes to show that dealing with the court -- Each time I tried to address the situation where I have the rights, the visitation rights, the court always tells me to go back and

seek a lawyer. Each time I seek a lawyer, I always lose. So why do I have to go back and seek a lawyer when it's already written in the situation that I must have visitation rights every other weekend?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And in a sense, I think I'm looking at the interest of the child for both persons involved. This person at the time and still is married. At the time, I was married, still is married. That would bring on hostile situations towards both families. And I'm just looking at the situation that -- I'm not trying to not do my responsibility, but I feel like I'm not getting the justice of the court, that I'm not getting my legal rights to visit with the child or the child to visit with me.

The child is at the age of six now. The child doesn't know me.

I don't know the child. But as I indicated earlier, that once I go back to court, they always tell me, Go get a lawyer. After I have spent several monies on a lawyer, there still is not any custody.

And I think the child support guidelines need to look at certain situations based on need, based on the need plus best interest of the child. And that's why I'm here today to actually speak my interest of it.

And it's actually bringing mental anguish to both parties, you know, when you're dealing with a situation like this when you're involved with a child in the center of it. Both families are married, and here is your child calling the other parent daddy while I'm the daddy and he doesn't know.

So I do want a relationship,

but I keep using the word hostile when situations occur like this and the court didn't look at it.

The court didn't look at the situation where this could cause damage.

And I passed out some forms there, and those three documents indicate the first time I went to court where I had to pay out a certain amount of money. And at the time, I really didn't know that that was my child, and after a year had passed, of course, I had to pay all back pay with interest on it. And it took me about seven years to do that.

And as of now, I did go back
to court. On the second page -On the second document, I did get
the payment reduced down to a
lower amount, and presently
that's what I'm paying now.

And as you can see on the last page where I made communication

to the other family, and the
family did write back and say,

Well, you have to comply with the
court order or we're going to
have to do certain things.

I've been willing to work with
the other family, but the other
family is not working with me.

the other family, but the other family is not working with me.

And I do have proof here. I know a story has two sides, but in this case here, I'm paying out that much money and not seeing the child. And each time I want to see the child, they always say, Seek a lawyer. So I think my rights are being violated.

And I'm just here to give my side of the story. Any questions?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: You're saying you had not established visitation rights?

MR. ANDERSON: Well, I do have established visitation rights. It did start off by meeting the child at a certain

1 area at a Hardee's. And after 2 that, you know, each time --3 Everywhere we go, the other 4 family would follow us. So it has 5 ceased now. I haven't seen the child since '98, and the court has 6 given me the right to see the child every other weekend. But 8 9 each time I go and try to make 10 this attempt, they say, Well, seek 11 a lawyer. Why should I seek a 12 lawyer? It's already written 13 down that I have visitation rights. And I'm still paying this 14 15 lucrative amount of money every 16 month. Yes, ma'am? 17 18 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Mr. 19 Anderson, who is telling you to 20 go and seek a lawyer? 21 MR. ANDERSON: Child 22 support. 23 COMMITTEE MEMBER: With DHR? 24

MR. ANDERSON: DHR, yes.

25

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Do you 2 understand that is probably in 3 concurrence with the law? 4 MR. ANDERSON: Excuse me? 5 COMMITTEE MEMBER: 6 They're probably required to do that by law. 8 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Mr. 10 Anderson. MR. ANDERSON: Yes. 11 12 COMMITTEE MEMBER: 13 stated you've had difficulty with DHR representing you in child 14 15 support matters; is that true? 16 MR. ANDERSON: Well, at 17 first DHR did represent me. The 18 lawyer in the first case, I didn't 19 even realize she was a lawyer for 20 DHR until after the fact. You 21 know, once they notified me --22 Once the deputy brought me the 23 subpoena to appear in court, you 24 know, I had to react pretty fast.

So I just got a lawyer that I

25

could afford at the time.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Would you say that child support has prevented you from being a father to your child at some time or other?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, sir.

And even with the back pay, they say it doesn't affect your credit, but it does. It goes on your credit report, and they look at that. They hold it against you, too.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well, let me encourage you, as a member of this Child Support

Committee, that you do have the right, that DHR is supposed to assist you in the child support modification process. And the committee has my presentation, and as Exhibit One, it shows a letter from the Department of Human Resources that says

1 compliance in this particular area. Let me repeat: DHR is 2 3 supposed to help noncustodial 4 parents with modifications of 5 their child support. I have a 6 copy of this memorandum. I'll get you a copy of it if you need 8 it. They're also out of 9 compliance in a number of areas. 10 Thank you, Mr. Anderson. 11 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you. 12 JUDGE GOSA: Thank you, sir. 13 Eric Poole Ashford? ERIC POOLE ASHFORD: I 14 15 made some copies, if you need a 16 сору. JUDGE GOSA: If you will 17 18 furnish copies if you have copies. 19 If you don't, we'll make sure you 20 have copies for all the committee 21 members. 22 MR. ASHFORD: I'm here, and 23 my name is Eric Ashford. I'm from Warrior, Alabama. And I'm 24

here to address the laws and

25

guidelines in the child support system.

You are being handed out a copy of what I have here. And I'm not a writer, so please excuse all the errors that you will find.

But I have been in child support since 1982. And my son is now twenty-one years old, and he has a child of his own. Now, I am here to point out the -- in my opinion and in the opinions of many others, how the court is biased and prejudiced. It is biased and prejudiced because there are an overwhelming number of men versus women paying child support.

For example, the court by laws are biased in using the phrase deadbeat dad. This phrase has cast a shadow over every man that comes into a courtroom. He is viewed as a hardened criminal. Because of this, many of the

fathers in situations that keep them from meeting their parental obligations are treated as common criminals.

Child support is a moral issue and not a criminal issue. But because there are laws against nonsupport, it is the court's obligation to review these laws and make every effort to assure equality to everyone who is involved. Nonsupport is punishable by law with jail time, bad credit, loss of driver's license, as well as other privileges.

Since being placed in child support, I am faced with all of the above. Even though I am current with my payment, deductions being taken from my paycheck every two weeks, I still face all of these if I was to lose my job, something were to happen to cause -- I had to go to

bankruptcy just to pay this amount.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I was told by a D. A. when I first went into court that if I didn't come up with X-amount of dollars when I came back to court, then I was going to go to jail. I had no option. I didn't have no way of getting the money. I didn't have any assets or anything to sell. I had no way of raising this money. I couldn't go get a loan because I could not --I could not go get a loan because of my credit. And I had no other choice but to go into bankruptcy. I didn't want to go into bankruptcy, but when the D. A. tells me that, I'm going to make sure the judge puts you in jail, I don't have any choice. I don't want to go to jail.

And at the time that this was told to me, they was cutting my check. They was cutting it out of

1 my check, payroll deduction, but 2 they wanted me to still come up 3 with this X-amount of dollars that I couldn't come up with. 4 So 5 I said, you know, I'll go to 6 bankruptcy. I went to bankruptcy, and that's something 8 that really bothered me because 9 the judge told me that, If 10 anything ever happens to your 11 job, I'm going to make sure you 12 go to jail. You know, and here I 13 am paying child support as best I 14 can, and still I'm threatened with 15 going to jail if something were to 16 happen to my job.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And she proved it to me. On one occasion, I was sent a letter for a court date. That letter was sent to the wrong address. I had given them my correct address.

And when I went to court on the day when I called -- I didn't get a letter, so I called. And once I called to find out when my court

date was, they told me it was on the 27 th.

I went on the 27th. After waiting about three hours there, I went and asked what was going on. They said, Well, your court date was on the 24th. I went downstairs to find out why I was not notified of that date. They told me a letter was sent to my house, but it was returned wrong address. So she looked on the file and saw I had given them the correct address. It was just in advertently wrote wrong.

And because of that, the judge had put an attachment out for my arrest. I tried to get another court date. And when I finally did get another court date, she -- I sat up there in court another three hours, and the judge told me at that time that she didn't have time to see me, she was busy, and I was taken into

custody.

At this time, they were still taking money out of my check. I was taken into custody, hauled off to jail with the threat of losing my job. I think that is totally unfair.

I am now nineteen thousand seven hundred and sixty-one dollars and twelve cents in debt. Three thousand nine hundred and forty-two dollars and sixty-four cents in actual child support owed, and fifteen thousand eight hundred and eighteen and forty-eight cents is interest. Interest alone. Interest on money that I can't hardly pay now is being taxed on every year that I don't have it.

I'm paying in bankruptcy right now, but at the end of each year, every time that it is not paid, interest is taxed on to that, putting me farther in debt.

1 I take child support very 2 seriously. Whenever you bring a 3 child into this world, you should take care of that child. 4 5 (unintelligible) that the court 6 uses are not fair. When it comes to custodial parents and 8 noncustodial parents, the 9 difference is overwhelming. 10 Noncustodial parents must have a 11 job in order to pay child support. 12 Not with the custodial parent. 13 When a noncustodial parent gets 14 behind, they are punished by a 15 late fee, arrest, high interest, 16 and privileges that could result 17 in loss of gainful employment. 18 However, this is not so for 19 the custodial parent. They are 20 not required to maintain 21 employment or supply the court 22 with this information. The 23 custodial parent can do exactly

what they want to do.

24

25

I have to have a job because I

was in child support. I believe if every -- if a woman or man wants to take someone to court for child support, then we ought to all be abiding by the same rules.

And this is -- but it's not just about the men and women. But it says here, if a woman gets pregnant, she has an option to have an abortion, which I don't support that but that is her right by the law. If she has the child and elects to keep it, she can carry it to the nearest hospital, no questions asked. Or she has the opportunity to use an adoption agency. These options are not given to the man if he decides after pregnancy he is not ready for parenthood.

This again shows the overwhelming bias and prejudice that the court has towards men.

And I say that, you know, some of

these things you might think are terrible, but I don't have that option. If I go out and have an affair with a woman and then both of us agree that we don't want to have children at this time, we just want to live in that lifestyle, neither of us wants a child, if she gets pregnant, she has the option to go down and abort this child. Or if she don't want it, she can take it to the hospital or she can use an adoption agency.

JUDGE GOSA: Two minutes.

MR. ASHFORD: Thank you.

When a man is taken to child support, the woman has a D. A. and a case worker on her side informing her of all her rights and options. And the man has to afford his own attorney or use a public defender whose question is, How much money can you pay and how much money do you make.

In closing, I would like to suggest to the court that the law be reviewed to place more emphasis on our custodial parents and their intentions concerning the welfare of the child.

Children are often neglected by this parent who is not liable to the court for their finances even though the noncustodial parent is expected to live up to the responsibilities that the court

I think that if the custodial parent had to report what they were doing with the money -- I heard him say, you know, like a debit card -- and show that that parent is taking care of that child, then the noncustodial parent might be more willing to continue to pay.

has ordered by its court order.

I had an instance in my case where I had temporary custody of my child. I went to court, asked

the judge not to suspend my child support but let it go toward my arrearage. He (inaudible) went in one ear and out the other, and that didn't make sense. I had temporary custody of my son at that time, which made me the custodial parent. And I felt like I was mistreated in that case.

I'm finished.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I have a question not directly with this case, but it came up with some conversations I had with several attorneys before coming down here. And I don't think the committee here will address the twelve percent interest of arrearages.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I was going to ask, have you talked to your legislator about that?
That's set by state law. All judgments draw interest at twelve percent, but in this economy,

1 (unintelligible) excessive to me. 2 I'm not speaking for the 3 committee because we don't have anything to do with that. But 4 5 that has to be addressed through 6 your legislator. That's state The judges don't have any 8 choice but to follow it whether 9 we agree with it or not. So you 10 have to talk to your legislator 11 about those type things. We 12 don't have any control over that. 13 COMMITTEE MEMBER: When 14 you say that your son is twenty-15 one and he has a son, are you 16 paying on arrearage? You're not 17 paying child support. 18 MR. ASHFORD: I'm paying my 19 arrearage. 20 COMMITTEE MEMBER: I think 21 you said something about at some 22 point in time being the custodial

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER: And

MR. ASHFORD: Yes.

parent; is that right?

23

24

1 you didn't seek child support? 2 MR. ASHFORD: I didn't. All 3 I asked for was them to take what 4 I owed from my regular payment, 5 just go towards my arrearage because I wanted to get it out of 6 the way because I'm always 8 threatened with going to jail if I 9 don't. That threat just hangs 10 over my head. 11 COMMITTEE MEMBER: So is 12 that what was done? 13 MR. ASHFORD: No. It 14 wasn't. He said (unintelligible) 15 that didn't make sense. It went 16 in one ear and other the other. 17 COMMITTEE MEMBER: What 18 the Justice is asking you, did you 19 ask for child support from the 20 mother when you had custody? 21 MR. ASHFORD: I didn't ask 22 for child support. I didn't want 23 her to pay me nothing. All I 24 wanted was my child support to go

toward paying (inaudible).

25

1	COMMITTEE MEMBER: You
2	should have asked for child
3	support.
4	JUDGE GOSA: Any other
5	questions? Thank you, sir.
6	Artreca Thomas and Cynthia
7	Townsend?
8	Are you Ms. Thomas?
9	ARTRECA THOMAS: I'm Ms.
10	Thomas. Cynthia is back there.
11	JUDGE GOSA: Okay. Is she
12	going to make a presentation?
13	MS. THOMAS: She is not.
14	JUDGE GOSA: Okay. Thank
15	you.
16	MS. THOMAS: Good morning.
17	I feel like an endangered species
18	as a custodial parent in here this
19	morning. But obviously, no one
20	else in here has been to Pike
21	County because they're
22	(unintelligible) on custodial
23	parents.
24	Due to conflict of interest, I
25	have changed case workers four

times. One was dating my

children's father. One was

related to my children's father.

And the other was sent to Iraq.

So now my case worker is the

supervisor of case workers. So

that's a problem we have in Pike

County.

But as far as the gentleman was saying about the debit cards, we're having enough trouble with textbooks and schools, so would that also mean they would install debit machines in schools because, as you can see, I am a single mother of three children.

And I attend Troy State

University, and I work, also.

But it's not fair that my
children can't take band or they
can't take -- or get involved in
other activities because Dad
doesn't want to pay this week. If
the judge orders for him to make
a payment of whatever amount of

dollars per week or per month,
then he should be made to pay
that money. And if I call my
case worker and ask why isn't he
paying it, I'm told that I should
be glad I'm receiving something.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If the guidelines also are saying where documentation should be shown as to their income, that also does not happen in Pike County. He can hire an attorney and give whatever amount he wants to give. They sign the affidavit, and that is what their payments are based on, because my children's father drives a truck. He owns his own truck, but he subleases through Wal-Mart. They don't include the shares that he may get through Wal-Mart. So that's really not benefiting -- I am -- Cynthia and I are (unintelligible) few mothers who are willing to go without so that our children will have. And

that's why we're here today.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The guidelines are okay, but when you have a judicial system like ours in Pike County who are not complying with the guidelines, then it's really not benefiting us.

If my children's father and Cynthia's children's father, if they already have a family after they have got children, it isn't our fault that they are already paying family coverage for them. So they're -- that's not helping us when we're getting the money deducted from child support to benefit them for insurance. They're already paying family coverage. So by them adding our children to their coverage, that is not helping me. But when the judge says that he is responsible or they're responsible for half of unreimbursable insurance expenses, then we send them

certified letters and copies of documentation, we don't receive anything.

The thing also says about the entire income. And I was looking that up, and it was saying about other expenses that take away from expenses that the noncustodial parent would pay. Well, my children's father went out and bought a racecar, but he couldn't pay child support that month. My children's father went out and bought some cows because his buddy was buying cows, so my children didn't get child support that week.

So it's not fair to us who are working, who are using the money wisely for our children to have this taken from us. And since child support is not money to play with, the person paying child support does not finance the custodial parent's dates,

vacation, or otherwise. Child

support is exactly what it is

called, support for the children.

There are some of us that do

support our children with child

support.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One of the dumbest attitudes around is people who withhold child support just to get back at other parents or to simply retain what control of a failed relationship. The only ones suffering in the long run are the children. Nonpayment of child support can lead to substandard conditions for our children. When a child gets old enough to understand what has been done, they will end up resentful of the parent who neglected their financial responsibility.

My children's father has
visitation, also, and I do not try
to hold my children from him. He
can come get them every other

weekend, but since he has a new six-month-old baby, he chooses not to come get them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Because one of my children is -- I have a set of twins who are six years old. We go to Birmingham every six months to the Diabetes Clinic. Cynthia has a daughter who's sick often, also, which she has made many trips to Montgomery to dermatologists with her daughter. The doctor may prescribe something this week. She may be allergic to it, so that means she comes back next week to get something to counteract for what happened last week.

Well, we're not reimbursed for any travel. When Mia goes to Birmingham, her dad never calls to say, Well, is Mia going to Birmingham, What has the doctor said, Does she need anything.

No. I am the only one that's

there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be paid.

His mother used to come and get the children every other weekend, but since he's gotten married, his mom said that's not her responsibility. That's his.

He doesn't call the children.

I have Kayla, who's been taking clogging for three years. I have Nia, one of the twins, since kindergarten has been taking ballet. I have Mia, the other twin, who is now taking tap. I feel my children need to be involved with other things, as their classmates are. This summer, all three of my girls will be taking golf because I want them to be well-rounded people. I want them to experience other things, the things that I didn't experience. But in order for them to experience all these things, the child support needs to

I am an employee of Troy City Schools. So, of course, as I'm paid by the Board of Education, of course, I don't make any money. But that's why I am back in school, and Cynthia also is about to start back at Troy State. We are the single mothers who are out there trying to do all that we can for our children.

So we're not here asking for daddies to pay more money.

We're asking for daddies to pay what is told for them to pay now.

That is the only thing we are asking for. The guidelines are there, but they are not being implemented in Pike County.

And, like I said, as far as the case workers, that doesn't even apply in Troy because everyone in Troy knows everyone in Troy.

And if she doesn't like me -Okay. Friends -- My latest case worker is the best friend of my

children's father. And the
director of DHR in Troy made the
comment to me that --

(Whereupon, Videotape One ended, after which Videotape Two began with a speaker already in progress as follows:)

BRADLEY BARBER: -- through his brother with the lead attorney in town. And so it started. And so I have been to the Appellate Court now nine times just to see my children. Finally they said, I want to be adopted. So after sixteen years of not seeing them and paying child support, they're now adopted.

Guess what, ladies and gentlemen. Just so you'll know how bad this system is, she went to DHR's attorney and got, for thirty-five dollars, a contempt petition against me for failure to pay current support. And I have

1 an adoption effective May 22 2 (inaudible). How can she do 3 How can she do that? It upsets me beyond belief. 4 5 Well, yeah, it's brought upon 6 (unintelligible), but will the 7 judicial branch step forward? 8 No. I don't expect that. But 9 they ought to because I assure 10 you, there are five hundred 11 thousand plus who would like be here today. You would be here 12 13 for weeks hearing story after 14 story that this child support 15 guidelines must be modified to 16 reflect our current method of 17 living. Thank you. 18 19 JUDGE GOSA: All right. 20 We'll be in recess until 1:30. 21 (Whereupon, a lunch recess 22 was had, after which the 23 videotape was restarted 24 with a speaker already in

progress as follows:)

25

1

2 3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

dollars profit. And none of that

MICHAEL A. POLEMENI: assumption is made that all child support is spent for the benefit of the children. No consideration given for supplemental costs by the noncustodial parent. The courts and DHR must establish accountability of funds spent for the child.

I can only go into my personal anecdotes. And that's my child asked me, you know, that she needed additional funds to do something during the month. And I asked her what her mother was doing with the money. She said that the money -- says that it's going for rent. I find that unacceptable. My ex owns the house that we were living in; is making mortgage payments. She for a dollar sold her interest into her new husband for a dollar; refinanced for thirty thousand

money goes to my children. In my original decree, which was rejected, I requested that fifty percent of the house profits go to my children. So that's all null and void.

So there's really no accountability in the system that

So there's really no accountability in the system that what's being given to the children is being spent on the children.

I did a very poor job of presenting this, but there is a brief by Mark Rogers out of Georgia that is attached. And it goes into more detail of all the legal issues and so forth on that. And that's really all I have to say. I appreciate your time.

JUDGE GOSA: Any questions?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Do you know the format or the process that Mr. Rogers refers to (inaudible)?

MR. POLEMENI: I don't know.

I think Georgia has, yes.

JUDGE GOSA: Thank you.

Kelley Christian?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

KELLEY CHRISTIAN: My name is Kelley Christian. I'm from Molton, Alabama. I am both a custodial and a noncustodial parent. I really didn't know what to talk about here. I had some, you know, some questions. But I appreciate you hearing, I mean, about personal situations. I think it gives us the opportunity to really get -- allows you to see the affect that some of the decisions that are made on the people out in the general populous of the state.

I mean, I really feel in here that when you've got Ms. Thomas and Ms. Townsend, they're doing everything they can to spend the money that they get, when they can get some money, for the benefit of the children.

Unfortunately, that's not always the case. Just like statistics will show that eighty to eighty-five percent of the fathers are paying child support as asked to. But it's the other fifteen percent that puts a bad light on the fathers who are trying. So the system is really messed up. It works both ways.

So in trying to decide on what to talk about and what to say, I recall a circuit judge's instructions to the jury whenever they were going out on a case.

And he cautioned the jurors, he said, Folks, let me explain something to you. Right and wrong have nothing to do with the law. It's sad, but the law is the law.

And that's -- that drove me to think about what I wanted to talk about and things here. And it's just, what is the law? And the

federal government gives us a mandate that we are to follow. Some of the information that was passed out to you -- and I'm not going to go into it in detail. All of you are -- I know are more familiar with the law than I am.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I have a memorandum from, I think, John Remington Graham. He was asked to do a study or this paper for the state and look at what Alabama's doing. When you look in the paper on the last couple of pages and all, it tells that because Alabama's guidelines are not based on authentic economic data that estimates the actual cost of raising children and do not apportion the board fairly between both parents according to their resources, they are not valid under the Federal Family Support Act. Consequently, these guidelines, if not properly

revised, may be struck down in
litigation before the Court of the
United States. The State of
Alabama needs proper guidance in
reviewing and rewriting
guidelines to meet federal
standards.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Also, Mr. Graham goes on to comment that -- I also provided each of you with a critique of Alabama's guidelines provided by Mark Rogers. I think, Mr. Ford, you asked if there were any states that had adopted Mr. Rogers' formulas. I think Georgia. Mr. Rogers was instrumental in rewriting and bringing Georgia into guideline compliance. The same with Tennessee. Also, I believe he was involved in Minnesota. In contacting -- In contacts that I've had with Mr. Rogers back and forth about this position paper or this

memorandum paper, I know he has

provided testimony before

Congress in Washington. One of

the times I couldn't get him

because he was in Washington and

all. So Mark Rogers is an

economist. His numbers come

from actual economic studies.

And we've heard a lot of talk today about the PSI reports.

Actually, PSI, their initial numbers came from a guy that was doing an immigration study, only it had nothing to do with child support or the cost of raising children and economics involved.

So I won't carry on (unintelligible). We have the information there that says that right now, we are not in compliance with federal guidelines.

So I want to move on to -- I

have another paper here that I

would like one of the gentlemen

to make some copies for me. This

1 is something that I got off the 2 web, and it's by another -- he's 3 another child support economist. 4 He does a lot of work with child 5 support. His name is Roger Gay, 6 and this is a quote out of one of 7 his papers. And he heads up a 8 project for improvement of child 9 support litigation.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It says: While surfing the web today, I ran across a rather disconcerting commentary at the Alabama Office of the Courts site. The page is titled Child Support Information. Before revealing the details, I should note that Alabama is presenting the same misinformation as do many other states. The quote you find below is quite similar to a statement made in, for example, the Indiana statutes. One would think that the Alabama Office of the Courts would do its best to provide the public with accurate

information. Yet I immediately
found obvious misinformation and
wrote to AOC to tell them about
it.

Okay. It says: The State of Alabama Basic Child Support

Obligations were developed through research sponsored by the National Center for State Courts and is based on extensive economic research on the cost of supporting children at various income levels.

The fact of the matter is that the National Center for State

Courts has never sponsored the development of a Schedule of Basic Child Support Guidelines based on economic factors. So this paper has a lot of interesting information. I would like a copy of it made and distributed to each member.

And that's about all I have other than one thing that I did do

before I came down this week is I got out, and I talked with several attorneys in the little town that I live in. And believe me, I saw more traffic down here trying to get here from six miles down the road today than I see in a week in town and everything, you know.

So, but anyway, there seemed to be a lot of question as to whether we ought to use -- Some people said, you know, We ought to be using net pay rather than gross pay because the fact of the matter is, you don't bring home gross pay. You do not have it available to use and all whenever -- after you get your paycheck.

Another thing was overtime. I

-- And I don't want to get into

war stories. But a particular

situation, suffice it to say that I

was working a great deal of

overtime before I divorced. This

was used -- Actually what you do

make them a slave to overtime if you use it in the initial computation because you've got to work it to sustain your child support order. If it's based on a figure that includes overtime and you quit working overtime, then you're not going to be able to live. So there's a consensus among the people that I talked to that would like to see the child support based on forty hours a week -- a week's work.

Also, you have heard accountability, which that's tough to tackle, and I don't really know just the (unintelligible) to find a method of accountability on here.

Another area of concern by one attorney was the interest on the arrearage, and we've done discussed this today, that that would be where there's a

1	legislative action. But it's just
2	like income tax and all. What
3	you do is you pay the arrearage
4	first before you even start
5	knocking a dent in the back
6	support owed and everything.
7	And so if it's accumulating on
8	the guy that's paying on his
9	arrearage, he's not ever reducing
10	the principal and everything most
11	likely because my understanding
12	is that the interest is paid first
13	and everything.
14	COMMITTEE MEMBER: That's
15	incorrect. Your principal is paid
16	first. Your interest is paid last.
17	MR. CHRISTIAN: Okay. Well,
18	that was
19	COMMITTEE MEMBER: The
20	law was amended about five years
21	ago on that.
22	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Only in
23	child support, not other types of

 $\ j\ u\ d\ g\ m\ e\ n\ t\ s\ . \qquad B\ u\ t\quad t\ h\ e\ r\ e\quad w\ a\ s\quad a\ n$

amendment to the law. That's

24

25

correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CHRISTIAN: Well, my
case was over five years so that's
-- at the time it was.

Okay. I've got another guy whose concern was overtime, gross pay versus net pay, second families. I mean, what we are saying is that, you know, one child is not as important as the other child. And I've heard and we've heard stories, and it just tears your heart. I mean, I don't know, and I pray to God that each one of you don't know what I'm talking about. But it is sad whenever you have to make a choice on, Do I pay the light bill or do I buy Christmas presents. Maybe I can pay my light bill, half of it this time and half of it next time, and I have to make Christmas presents. I know, I mean, because I've had to face that decision, you know.

So it's easy for us to sit here and say -- The media likes to talk about parents, noncustodials that won't pay, like to put their picture in the paper because it makes us think we're doing something. And actually, what we're doing is superficial. I mean, it's to feel good and all, and that's what it's about.

And another attorney, she mentioned that she was concerned that second families, children of second marriages wasn't getting the same treatment, the same protection under the Fourteenth Amendment that children of first marriages were and credit for visitation.

And irregardless of what we have decided or what's been -the best efforts have been made to do the right thing, the fact is I have three children. One of my children lives with me. He

elected to live with me. And I provide a bedroom for each one of them. So I add bedroom furniture to that because whenever the divorce was taken into account, he says, Whatever you (unintelligible) the furniture goes with the children, which is okay. I mean, I knew that they needed it. But it didn't change the fact that I had to provide for them when they came to my house.

And so it doesn't matter with me if you're not getting your kids but one day a month, you should have one-thirtieth credit for the time that they're there because you have the same factors involved as the custodial parent does with light bills, extra food, extra shelter. And so I really would like to see a formula gathered.

And I do have another piece of information because I seen that

1 somebody's information that they 2 gave out -- I believe it was Mr. 3 Blackston's today -- that said, 4 Well, how do we account for that. 5 And in the study by Mark Rogers 6 -- And I understand Mr. Rogers is supposed to be here tomorrow, 8 and I would really like to hear 9 from Mr. Rogers. He can tell you 10 his numbers better than I can. 11 But I have a worksheet prepared 12 over here that was taken from his 13 work that will go down, and it 14 will show you how it's not about 15 we're going to have to sit down 16 here and develop a whole new 17 worksheet for this information or 18 what you think. So it takes into 19 account the tax benefit. It takes 20 into account the percentage of 21 time that the children are in the noncustodial's home. It takes 22 23 into account the tax benefit that 24 the custodial parent gets off of 25 having custody of the children.

1 So I'm going to get that and 2 pass it out to you, and that's all 3 I've got. 4 COMMITTEE MEMBER: What county are you from? 5 MR. CHRISTIAN: Lawrence 6 County, Alabama. 8 JUDGE GOSA: James Noble 9 Anderson? 10 JAMES NOBLE ANDERSON: Мy name is James Noble Anderson. 11 12 I'm from here in Montgomery. I 13 thank you for the opportunity to talk in the presence of the 14 15 committee. I'm making this 16 relatively short and just to the 17 point. 18 I'm a custodial parent that shares joint legal and physical 19 20 custody of our six-year-old son 21 with his mother. And I would 22 just like to -- From what I 23 understand, the present 24 guidelines do not specifically

address child support considering

25

joint custody situations and take into account the child's time with each parent and the expenses that are involved with caring for the child in each of his or her homes.

I would like to please consider -- the committee please consider factoring in the parenting time that's required with that and expenses to both parents in regard to the children in determining a fair, equitable, and reasonable support order.

Also, please consider allowing for the parent paying child support to be allowed the opportunity of declaring the child or children as a dependant on state and federal income tax law. I don't know if that's anything this committee could possibly do. But I think that's something that would be equitable as well.

Thank you.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Could I

1 ask a question? You mentioned 2 about joint custody. 3 MR. ANDERSON: I share joint legal and physical custody with 4 5 our son. COMMITTEE MEMBER: Does 6 your divorce decree delineate 8 what parenting time each has? 9 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, sir, it 10 does. Roughly, he is with me 11 about -- if you look at the total 12 number of days per year, he's 13 with me thirty-seven percent of 14 the time of the days. 15 COMMITTEE MEMBER: That's 16 addressed in the guidelines for shared custody. I address that in 17 18 my court. I mean, I don't know what happened in your case, but 19 20 it is addressed. 21 MR. ANDERSON: But 22 apparently it's not factored in as 23 much --24 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Was

your case tried or was it settled?

25

1	MR. ANDERSON: Yes, sir.
2	COMMITTEE MEMBER: It was
3	tried?
4	MR. ANDERSON: Yes, sir.
5	JUDGE GOSA: Any other
6	questions? Thank you.
7	MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.
8	JUDGE GOSA: Tim Smith?
9	TIM SMITH: If you will give
10	me a moment to set the podium up
11	for a tall guy.
12	Good afternoon. My name is
13	Tim Smith. I reside in Morgan
14	County at 145 Hamaker Street in
15	Decatur. I am the President of
16	the Alabama Family Rights
17	Association, a nonprofit group of
18	people concerned about the affect
19	divorce is having on families,
20	children, and parents. Thank you
21	for allowing ALFRA members to
22	address this committee today.
23	Divorce now occurs in over
24	half of marriages, and this fact
25	holds true in marriages that

involve children. The members of this committee are in a position to directly affect how divorce impacts the members of divorced families. As the strict roles of mothers and fathers have changed, so have the divorce decrees handed down by judges in this state. This erosion of the customary family that has placed us with the role of parent is gender neutral. Willing parents of either sex can and must be both a provider and a nurturer.

My understanding of Rule 32
is that it assures judges see to
the equitable financial support of
children after a marriage has
been dissolved. The formula
result is held as the proper
amount to be awarded and can
only be deviated from with an
agreement between the parties or
a finding by the court.

Prior to the Rule, judges

could set any amount of support according to his or her sole discretion. The Rule is used to set a certain amount for the everyday welfare of children of divorced families.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, to the point I wish to address. Under the comments section of Rule 32 available for download on the website of the Administrative Office of the Court, the following is found: The Schedule of Basic Child Support Obligation is premised on the assumption that the noncustodial parent will exercise customary visitation rights, including summer visitation. Any abatement of child support because of extraordinary visitation should be based on visitation in excess of customary visitation.

That statement in the

comment: The Schedule of Basic

Child Support Obligation is premised on the exercising of customary visitation, including summer visitation. My question is: What is customary visitation? What is summer visitation? What is extraordinary?

The State of Alabama does not have a customary visitation guidelines that judges must adhere to. As the issue of customary visitation is referenced in the Rule, it must be quantified. In the American Heritage Dictionary, Second College Edition, customary is defined as: commonly practiced or used as a matter of course.

As each circuit court is allowed to form its own visitation orders, how is this addressed in the Rule? It is not. Most judges rule on divorce and, lacking an agreement by the parties, arbitrarily place their own

visitation schedule into the order. Is this judge's order customary or extraordinary? Even with an agreement of the parties, how is a judge to know what excess is or if under-visitation is occurring?

If customary is not defined, how can anyone, even the most learned judge, order or modify a support amount under the Rule?

This is a great disservice to the parents, the children, and the presiding judge.

At one time, visitation was every other weekend and two weeks in the summer. This may still be the case in some counties. Have all counties been polled to find the average total days per year with the noncustodial parent? I would hope so. How else can we know the definition of customary visitation in Alabama?

Notice this comparison
involving the one-time customary
visitation and the standard
visitation now in place in Morgan
County for just legal custody. As
you can see, the customary
visitation has changed to more
reflect the relationship that
parents have with their children
today.

Under the visitation schedule in Morgan County, the child is now with the noncustodial parent forty-two percent of the time.

This is in and of itself shared physical custody. Yet, no allowances are made under the Rule for this large increase in customary visitation. The new guidelines and the schedule must reflect the time spent with both parents or it is not valid.

Here is a statement directly from the Rule: Reasons for deviating from the guidelines.

Reasons for deviating from the guidelines may include, but are not limited to, the following:

Shared physical custody or visitation rights providing for periods of physical custody or care of children by the obligor parent substantially in excess of those customarily approved or ordered by the court.

This statement is in its entirety vague and undefined. Nowhere in the Rule is shared physical custody or excess defined or quantified. If you and I share the cost of dinner, does this mean we each pay half the total cost or can we share on percentage? Is shared custody a fifty-fifty split of parenting time or any amount over a minimum? What is substantial? How much is excess? If the guidelines do not clarify, the guidelines create confusion.

Here is the definition of a rule, also from the American Heritage Dictionary: Rule, a usual or customary course of action or behavior. Rule 32 was intended to be used as customary in application. Therefore, it must have definite parameters so those applying the Rule know when deviation is called for.

Visitation orders of courts may differ widely under the Rule. Likewise, the definition of substantial and excess will differ under the opinion of every judge in this state. Unless there is definition, I see lots of problems with Rule 32.

This committee has received a study from a contracted source.

In Chapter Four page two of this study, the statement is made that visitation costs are not factored into the schedule. This is in direct conflict with Rule 32 as

the customary is presumed exercised and the schedule is premised on that assumption.

Either the guidelines must factor in visitation, or the schedule must be redone to reflect time with the noncustodial parent.

I urge you as a committee charged with providing the Supreme Court (unintelligible) to look closely at the data used to obtain the schedule. Using assumptions or extrapolating an estimate for the State of Alabama from nationwide data does not reflect real situations or costs.

Using estimates is not valid data. Invalid data -- Using invalid data produces invalid results.

Failing to factor in the cost
of visitation while saving time
and effort penalizes parents for
exercising their rights. Thirtyfour states have seen the problem
caused by not factoring in

visitation into the calculation of support. Thirty-four states now allow for deviation from the child support schedule either by using a formula with built-in allowances or a deviation factor. The majority of these states allow adjustments using a threshold of twenty to thirty percent. These states have clear, concise guidelines for courts to follow thereby assuring that each support ruling is equitable.

At present, fourteen states, including Alabama, allow for deviation but do not specify a formula or percentage threshold.

Giving Alabama courts very refined formulas with deviations tied to present visitation schedules will assure the children receive equal support at both residences.

I charge you as a noncustodial parent and resident of this state

to do your utmost to assure the child support guidelines and schedule allow for equitable treatment of parents. There are guidelines and schedules in other states that meet the criteria for shared parenting and joint legal custody and are referenced in the contracted study.

Other solutions? Other solutions have also been presented here today. Leaving the Rule as it is or just allowing for a wholesale change to the support schedule is not acceptable. Both of these options fail the children and parents of this state. Divorced parents are looking to you to put forth the best guideline schedule that can be formed. We cannot advise the Supreme Court. This committee can.

Please know that there are resources available to this

committee that would not require the expenditure of public funds. ALFRA has members ready and willing to assist in the forming of the new schedule along with new guidelines. These parents reside in this state, know firsthand the cost of raising children in Alabama and are aware of the issues facing families of divorce.

Finally, I'd address the problems with the guidelines, the present and proposed schedule.

You are now aware of these problems. You members of the Advisory Committee must now act and so must the Supreme Court to address these issues. These problems directly affect the ability of divorced parents to support our children during the time they are with us. We're watching and waiting for the results of this committee and the

actions of the court.

Thank you.

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE GOSA: Any questions?

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Do
you have any resources or can you
tell the committee of any
resources available that would -to show us what these guidelines
are that impact the visitation?

MR. SMITH: In the PSI study, I've seen it, other states' guidelines are referenced, and there are certain thresholds. Most of the time, there's a minimum. From what I've read in the study, there's a basic threshold of support, and then once you have time with the noncustodial parent over and above that, the support level is factored down. I'm not an economist. I'm not a statistician. I'm not a public speaker either.

But there's resources

available. Other states have seen the need to allow for this right here. And as a matter of case in point, this is my visitation.

That's the only county I can speak of. That's my visitation, and I do pay the full amount ordered by Rule 32. No factor is made for excess time spent with them.

Y e s, m a ' a m ?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: So
you're saying that you have the
child forty-two percent of the
time, but you pay the full amount
of what you are -- were scheduled
to --

MR. SMITH: Yes, ma'am. I'm paying the full obligation as if I received a customary visitation.

I have him forty-two percent of the time, and in excess of that in reality because I get him when his mother is unavailable, when she's out of town. This is what

it says in the order, and this is

what two weeks in the -- or every

other weekend and two weeks in

the summer represent and time at

Christmas. And that's the only

thing I can speak to of what I

know firsthand.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Did
you settle your case or was it
tried?

MR. SMITH: No, sir. My case was tried.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Did
you appeal it?

MR. SMITH: I did not have the funds to appeal it. I talked to a couple of attorneys, and it would have been anywhere from ten to fifteen thousand dollars.

After the initial decree, I did not have the funds to do that, sir. I was awarded a substantial amount of my time. I'm here to assure you that most all parents look at this factor first, how much time

1 we have with our children. The 2 monetary issues, I can be quite 3 frank with you and say I'm not 4 starving. But it has directly 5 affected the relationship that I 6 have with my son at my house as compared to his mother. He can 8 definitely see the difference in 9 income, and we make exactly --10 you may as well say exactly the 11 same amount of money. But the 12 lifestyle change is completely 13 different in my house than it is 14 at his mother's. But I'm just -- I 15 considered appealing, but it was 16 financially impossible. 17

Thank you. I have a copy of my presentation. Unfortunately, I couldn't make a whole lot of copies. If y'all would, just run copies out and pass it out.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE GOSA: Paul Bivens?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: What
county are you from?

PAUL BIVENS: I'm from

Elmore County.

I, too, thank you for the opportunity to speak before the committee. I am here as an individual, but I am also a member of Alabama Family Rights Association. I belong to that organization because it is a positive organization that stresses parents' relationships with their children, both mother and father.

As I was hooking my way up here from Crampton Bowl, I passed the Capitol and noticed a group of children on their way for a tour. And I have to tell you that it is heartening to see that kind of thing. Parents like to see their children involved in those kinds of educational activities, especially knowing that one day they're going to be lawmakers.

One of the reasons I belong to

this organization, too, is not so much that I truly expect decisions to affect me. I do not want this experience to be shared by them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My name is Paul Bivens. I am one of the proud parents of Brittany and Austin Bivens. I'm originally from the State of Texas, graduate of the University of Texas. My wife agreed to name our son Austin. I had suggested we name our daughter Dallas, but she resisted saying she couldn't stand at the backdoor and yell, Austin, Dallas, thinking that sounded too much like a bus or train station. I might have a problem with some of her other decisions, but she may have been right about that.

The happiest days of my life were October 8th, 1983, the date of our marriage, June 15th, 1988, and March 15th, 1990, the birthdays of our children. Among

the saddest is June 2nd, 1992, the date of our divorce.

I am not here to complain about excessive child support levels, although that is a problem. Others will address that issue. I'm here to encourage you to see child support in a broader context.

Please consider that it means far more than simple financial support. While it's no longer necessary for me to carry them, my children still need me to lean on. At fourteen and sixteen, they don't need me to read to them any longer, but they do need me to discuss what they've read. They don't need me to change them, but they do need me to help them deal with changes they're having.

I am here as an individual but a proud member of Alabama
Family Rights. It includes both mothers and fathers, children,

grandparents, and other extended family. Our motto is: Children need both parents even after a divorce.

I hope to dispel a few of the more popular myths. First, that this process is fundamentally fair. One quickly finds oneself unable to defend oneself both financially, given extreme legal costs involved, and of course it's completely unfair to the children who want and need both mother and father.

Secondly, it's a myth that most of us are leaving our marriages for another woman or our secretaries. In fact, most divorces are sought by the custodial parents, whatever grounds they wish.

Thirdly, it's a myth that we, quote, don't care, that our only concern is the amount of support we pay. In fact, a great

percentage of our time at the meetings deal with the amount of time that we're able to maintain with our children. Too many noncustodial parents simply give up given a clear message that only their money matters.

Next, I ask that you consider some important terms involved.

For example, defendant.

Defendant comes to replace husband or best friend.

Noncustodial. With respect, I am not a noncustodial parent.

I'm a father. Neither is my former wife custodial parent.

She's a mother.

Deadbeat. No one supports
those who do not care for their
children. Unfortunately,
however, perception has been
falsely fostered that most
divorced men are deadbeats. Only
due to political correctness says
that term would now become

deadbeat parents. Our former governor used the term lost dogs.

Please consider that there are far more deadbolt dads, those shut out of the lives with their children than deadbeat dads.

Visitation. Again, with respect, I do not visit my children. I'm their father. I instruct, love, and parent them.

No-fault divorce. If there ever was an oxymoron, it's no-fault divorce. There's plenty of fault to go around.

Best interest of the child.

Unfortunately, this term

(unintelligible) comes to mean

whatever those in authority says

it means. It's like beauty in the

eyes of the beholder.

Accountability. This currently popular buzz word could scarcely be more one-sided than when considering child support.

Finally and ironically, Rule

__

3 2 refers to child support
guidelines for those of us here
today. That means grounds for
reversal when applied to criminal

cases.

Next, in terms of purely financial support. You will hear better explanations of the concerns -- of these concerns on the part of others. Still, let me ask that you consider the fundamental inadequacy of the present policy, which forces financial support or the pain of incarceration on the part of the noncustodial parent while requiring no accountability or any proof of financial support by the custodial parent.

Further, many extras are required in child-rearing, housing, clothing. I and other noncustodial parents provide fully furnished rooms and all new clothing. No adjustment is made

here for those lucky enough to have extended time beyond the typical.

Further, many have second families which also require support. Sometimes it's especially difficult providing for the needs of second spouses and children.

Personally, I have remained single for the past twelve years, knowing that in both terms of time and money, I must set priority on my children rather than having this (unintelligible) normal family life.

In closing, thank you for this opportunity. Very soon we must all file our income tax returns.

As added insult, no matter how much I pay or how hard I try, the federal government refuses to allow me deductions or even consider me head of household.

In recently speaking with a

my belief that parents should strongly support the education of their children. She voiced her agreement but stated she didn't mean divorced parents but, quote, real parents.

With respect, we are real parents. Think what you may be doing each Friday afternoon in the months to come. Those of us in this process know exactly what we'll be doing. We cross our fingers that important events will fall on those every other weekends that are ours in order to be with our children.

Finally, please recall the words of a country and western song. Country music has a special way of telling the truth.

Fathers, and one could add mothers, don't love their children every now and then. It's a love without end. And if I were in

church, I would ask can I get an amen.

JUDGE GOSA: Any question?

I don't believe we have any.

Thank you, sir.

Frank Hicks?

FRANK HICKS: Ladies and gentlemen of the Advisory

Committee for Child Support and Enforcement, thank you for having me today. My name is Frank

Hicks, and I'm a noncustodial parent, resident of the State of Alabama. I'm also a member of the Alabama Family Rights

Association. I do not work in any capacity of child support collections or enforcing agency. I just wanted to state that up front.

I'm here to speak to this distinguished committee today regarding the guidelines as issued by this committee for public comment. However, as important

as this issue of financial support for our children is, the purpose of the committee and the interest of the general public would be better served if this committee would have an ongoing dialogue with the interested members of the public and academia. This approach would be far better than listening to a series of ten-minute monologues originally (unintelligible) committee hearings.

The issue of certifying the validity of Alabama Rule 32 has set (unintelligible) committee here, and now we seem to be in a hurry to do something, anything, to meet an arbitrary, artificial deadline.

Alabama Rule 32 has numerous flawed assumptions and other problems, many of which other people have addressed here today and will address. Alabama Rule

1 32 politely ignores reality in a
2 number of key assumptions in the
3 interest of simplicity. However,
4 this oversimplification can lead
5 to some serious issues and
6 problems with validity of the
7 amount of child support set by
8 Rule 32.

Since I have only ten minutes to speak, I will focus on one key deficiency with Alabama Rule 32 that should be and can be corrected by this committee. As I'm sure that everyone on this committee and everyone in the audience here today realizes, our children are our future. We owe it to them to do the right thing. Every child is important and every child should count.

One of the key problems with

Rule 32 is that it ignores the

existence of real needs of

hundreds of thousands of children

born subsequent to the

noncustodial parent's initial divorce. The way Rule 32 is constructed, it fails to take into consideration the real needs of all children that a noncustodial parent is financially responsible for taking care of. The State of Alabama, using Rule 32, in effect tells these children that their needs do not matter simply because they had the misfortune of being born after the breakup of the noncustodial parent's previous marriage.

Ladies and gentlemen of the committee, if you will bear with me, I would like to tell you a little bit about my personal situation not -- only because my situation is so representative of what thousands -- hundreds of thousands on noncustodial parents deal with.

I have three children. I have Angela and Brian, and I have

Dillon. Angela and Brian were born to me in my first marriage in 1982 and 1985 respectively. Dillon Hicks was born in 1997. Rule 32 in the State of Alabama says this child's needs do not count. They have not been considered in determining what my child support is going to be. Their needs are paramount. Theirs come first. He doesn't count. I have to make -- take care of his needs with whatever is left over after I take care of Angela and Brian's needs. This is wrong.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have developed a -- Rather than just come here to explain today, I've developed a potential solution to this problem that could be incorporated into whatever guidelines, whatever numbers this esteemed committee chooses to use for the revision of Alabama Rule 32. I apologize for

not having a presentation graphic like Mr. Smith did there. He did a very good job. I think it would help. But I'm going to just try to tell you, and I've got a written copy here I'll leave with the committee and you can read it. I won't go into too much detail.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But basically, the way this would work is if you have -- for example, if you have three children, two of them by a previous marriage -- again, I'm just using my particular situation, but this would work just as well as if you had four or five. It doesn't matter. When you remarry and have another child, you should be able to go back to the court and ask for consideration and a recomputation of your child support. People do that every

day, and it's based on a material

change in circumstance. That
child support would be recomputed based on your current
income. That happens every day.
Nothing is different than what
we're doing now.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

After that, you look at how many children you're currently actually supporting, not just the children from the first marriage. So if I have a child support order based on income that gives me a particular amount for two children, I then go back and look at the same table for that income and look at what three children would be. The difference between the amount for two children and the greater amount for three children, the difference between those two could then be prorated back or subtracted back from the child support order for the first two children.

I hope you're with me. Again,

if you don't, I've got all this written out for you, and it will be a little easier to follow in writing.

So that would in effect at least allow for consideration for that third or fourth child. If it was four children, again, you would look at the table for four children, take the delta between -- the difference between the amount for four children and the amount for two children and subtract that back out of the order for two children.

This simple methodology could be very easily incorporated into whatever guideline number this committee chooses to use and would indeed at least allow for some consideration for children born in this state to parents who have been divorced and in second marriages.

Yes, ma'am?

1	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Mr.
2	Hicks, I've really been listening
3	very carefully today, and the
4	more I've heard it, the more
5	concerned I've become about the
6	fact that the second family,
7	the after-born children situation.
8	Does your former wife have
9	additional children?
10	MR. HICKS: My former wife?
11	N o .
12	COMMITTEE MEMBER: All
13	right. Well, let's assume that
14	situation. Let's assume you don't
15	have your third child. You just
16	have the two from the marriage.
17	Let's assume she has had two
18	more children by a subsequent
19	marriage. Would it then be fair
20	for her to come in and ask that
21	you pay more child support
22	MR. HICKS: Well, I assume
23	that she
24	COMMITTEE MEMBER:

because she's had additional

1	children?
2	MR. HICKS: I assume she has
3	remarried. And I know that's not
4	always the case.
5	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Do you
6	not see how it works both ways,
7	how the Rule has to apply in both
8	situations?
9	(Whereupon, several people
10	began speaking
11	simultaneously.)
12	JUDGE GOSA: Can we have
13	order, please?
14	MR. HICKS: I assume she had
15	those children with her husband,
16	and they are responsible for those
17	children.
18	COMMITTEE MEMBER: But
19	don't you see that you're making
20	her responsible for your
21	additional child?
22	MR. HICKS: She's not the one
23	paying child support. I'm paying
24	her.
25	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well, I

```
1
      just want to say that you're
2
      misunderstanding the way the
3
      child support guidelines work.
      I'll leave it on that note.
4
5
          COMMITTEE MEMBER: Also,
6
      about seven years ago (inaudible)
      the Court of Civil Appeals
8
      (inaudible) the court can go
9
      outside of the guidelines to take
10
      care of after-born children.
11
      (Inaudible.)
12
          MR. HICKS: Well, sir, I --
13
             (Whereupon, several people
14
             began speaking
15
             simultaneously.)
16
          MR. HICKS: Sir, I agree with
17
      you, sir. You cannot, and I feel
18
      very confident in saying what
19
      happens in one courtroom does not
20
      happen in most of the courtrooms.
21
          COMMITTEE MEMBER: That's
22
      the law in this state. That is a
23
      grounds for variation from the
24
      guidelines.
25
          MR. HICKS: I've talked to
```

1 hundreds of noncustodial parents, 2 and I have yet to talk to a one 3 that had any consideration for subsequent children. 4 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: We've 5 6 got thousands of satisfied customers out there. All I can 8 tell you is what I do and what the 9 law is, and I try to follow the 10 law. 11 MR. HICKS: Yes, sir, I 12 understand. I appreciate your --13 COMMITTEE MEMBER: And I 14 (unintelligible) Justice Stuart. 15 I've heard this so many times 16 today. Apparently, there's a 17 misconception that we can't 18 consider subsequent children. That's not the law. 19 20 MR. HICKS: I realize there's 21 a lot of vagaries in Rule 32 about what the judge is able to do, but 22 23 in practice, this is not true.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: It is in my court.

24

1	MR. HICKS: In your court, it
2	may be, sir, and I commend you
3	for that. But in most of the
4	courts in this state, I don't
5	believe it is.
6	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well, I
7	haven't polled all the courts, and
8	I can't speak to that. But I
9	(Whereupon, several people
10	began speaking
11	simultaneously.)
12	MR. HICKS: I've talked to
13	hundreds of parents. I am yet to
14	find one where that's happened.
15	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well,
16	that's not what's happening in my
17	courtroom.
18	MR. HICKS: Maybe not, sir.
19	But I'm asking that this be
20	explicitly addressed in Rule 32.
21	COMMITTEE MEMBER: I
22	understand.
23	MR. HICKS: That's all I'm
24	asking. And I have a formula
25	here I'm presenting to the

1	committee for your consideration.
2	You may act on it as you will,
3	sir, but this is a serious issue
4	f o r
5	COMMITTEE MEMBER: I
6	agree.
7	MR. HICKS: the children
8	in this state and the noncustodial
9	parents in this state.
10	Thank you.
11	Yes, ma'am?
12	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Under
13	the solution that you were
14	offering where you were talking
15	about the two kids (inaudible)
16	when you were talking about
17	going back to court and having it
18	re-evaluated, I think you had this
19	
20	MR. HICKS: Third child.
21	COMMITTEE MEMBER: the
22	third child. Under your proposal,
23	when you went back to have it re-
24	evaluated, did you take into
25	consideration (inaudible) your

1 new wife's salary (inaudible) 2 since you've got a child with her 3 and you've got two children with 4 other -- your former wife. t h e 5

I'm trying to understand --

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HICKS: Well, my personal situation is my current wife has zero income. She stays home and takes care of my son and my elderly mother, or she did until my mother went to a nursing home in January. But I realize most women work outside the home these days.

This is -- This formula I have does not consider third parties; i.e. husbands of the custodial parent, assuming that the custodial parent is the mother, or wives of the noncustodial parent in subsequent marriages. It looks at how many children the noncustodial parent that's paying child support must support. That's what it's looking at, pure

and simple. So I'll present this

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Let me ask you this: What would you think about this approach if the Court of Appeals said, We can't do this; the law would have to be changed. In your case, you came back on a modification and we calculated what you would be paying for child support for your third child that you and your present wife support and then let you count that as a deduction like you can on court-ordered prior child support. What do you think about that approach? There's a case that says we can't do that now, but perhaps we could convince the appellate courts that that's a fair approach.

MR. HICKS: I'm sorry, sir.

Can you step through that one

more time?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Okay.

Now, if you have a prior support order, you can deduct that from your gross (video malfunction).

For example, if you and your present wife went and got a divorce, then what you're paying for your first two children can be deducted from your gross income.

In these subsequent children cases, what if the law allowed you to calculate what you would be paying for child support for you and your present (video malfunction) even though there's not a prior court order? What would you think about that approach? I'm just asking --

MR. HICKS: Sir, that would be preferable to the situation we have now where there's (unintelligible). I have no problem with that. And I will say this: My youngest child will soon be nineteen in May. I'm not here for my personal situation.

1	COMMITTEE MEMBER: But
2	you bring a valid point about
3	these subsequent child issues. I
4	think it needs to be addressed.
5	I'm not sure we can do it.
6	(Whereupon, several people
7	began speaking
8	simultaneously.)
9	MR. HICKS: As you know, sir,
10	the majority of the people that
11	suffered a divorce eventually
12	remarry. Many of those do have
13	children. They marry
14	Sometimes they marry mothers
15	that have children.
16	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well,
17	we have the same problems where
18	people have illegitimate children
19	and they get married. I mean,
20	that's a problem.
21	MR. HICKS: It is a
22	complicated issue, sir. And I'm
23	just suggesting I know the
24	court prefers simplistic formulas,
25	and I'm just saying we can

oversimplify. And if we can come up with something that at least takes those other children into consideration, it's preferable to just totally ignoring their needs.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: No, they shouldn't be penalized because you had a prior divorce. It's always been my judgment if we could calculate what you would pay for that child were you and the present wife divorced and deduct that from your gross income, that would help protect that subsequent child.

MR. HICKS: Yes, sir, that
would be preferable than where
we are today. And I appreciate
your -- In fact, I appreciate the
entire committee listening to me.
I know there may be some of you
that disagree with what I'm
saying, and that's okay. It's
fine to disagree. And I would be
happy to work with anybody if

1 you need me.

I know this example I'm

putting here is somewhat

mathematically oriented. But if

you need any help, let me know,

and I'll be glad to help.

JUDGE GOSA: We have another question, I believe.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: No, sir. I actually have a comment on this. The -- As Mr. Hicks has pointed out, you've got a problem. You're looking for the solution. And, Your Honor, you're making allowances for this in your court, and that's where we get into a grey area of where you may be, someone else may not be.

And so one of the forms that I gave you on a guideline worksheet, it has a line -- I mean, it is taking into consideration about, you know -- to handle this problem, you know.

And then at this point, if you go on over into Mr. Rogers' work, then it tells you how to arrive, you know, at a figure. And it may be based off basically like something like what you're saying about how much support would you be paying on that. But what you do is you take that into account and all in the guideline worksheet and all. So then you have a more uniform process across the state if it's included in what the Supreme Court hands down for the court to use.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Can I comment on that?

(Unintelligible) says we're supposed to eliminate deviations as much as possible. At the present time, the joint custody and shared custody and children of second families are all deviations. We need to find a way, as Mr. Hicks has said, to

1 incorporate those into the tables 2 themselves or into the forms that 3 we use as we calculate child 4 support. 5 MR. HICKS: Nobody asked me 6 what county I'm from. I'm from Madison County by the way. 8 COMMITTEE MEMBER: I had that question. I just didn't get 9 10 to it. 11 JUDGE GOSA: Thank you, sir. 12 Ed Massey? 13 ED MASSEY: I apologize. I only have ten copies with me. 14 15 My name is Ed Massey, and 16 I'm from Huntsville, Alabama, Madison County. And I've taken 17 18 some time and gotten a copy of 19 PSI's reports and would like to 20 share some concerns with you 21 about them. 22 My first concern relates to 23 the child support schedule and 24 the projections and the way it

comes about determining child-

rearing costs in the state. The second is updated child support does not effectively deal with recent changes in the federal tax code and its reliance on gross income.

This schedule is not based on the cost of raising a child in the State of Alabama. True statement. It's been sixteen years. Nineteen eighty-eight is when we were asked to start figuring this out. We're in 2004. We're a smart state. We're a capable state. We should know those numbers. We should be able to do that.

I question, given the way this study has been done for the economics and the statistics in it, whether it is balanced or not. If you look at it, it is based on average data, based on Betson-Rothbarth, which is '96 to '99 data. That is basically adjusted

1 net income, adjusted to two 2 thousand three dollars based on 3 the Consumer Price Index. This 4 data has been statistically 5 adjusted based on census data in 6 the year 2000, which was 1999 data, to allow for a lower income 8 level in the State of Alabama. 9 We then take that and somehow, 10 which is not completely explained 11 here in their theory, and move 12 from net income numbers to gross 13 numbers.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, I'm an engineer by background. I'm a program manager and a space physicist. Statistically, this is very dicey. I mean, you're taking averages of numbers and you're moving them all around and hopefully coming out with a good number. And they may very well have, but the problem is we don't know.

Based on that, I urge you to have academics in this state, both

in statistics and economics, to
take a look at this. See if they
agree with them. If an engineer
has questions about it, perhaps
they would, too.

Second of all, federal tax code changes. PSI's report does not take into account changes in head of household, dependant deduction increases that have occurred recently, as well as child tax credit. The premise here is that the PSI numbers define the amount of child support required for a child in a year, which that is the case, and it comes up with their numbers.

We can take an example here.

If the custodial parents, both of them, have a child support obligation of a thousand dollars a month combined, and you split those seventy-thirty for twelve thousand dollars per year, okay?

Everybody with me here? If you

1 do that, the custodial -- Say the 2 noncustodial has the seventy 3 percent burden and the custodial 4 parent has the thirty percent 5 burden, which is somewhat 6 reasonable, not far off the ballpark. You must then take 8 into account the two thousand 9 dollars worth of federal tax 10 credit. That is just a pure 11 windfall for the mother. You go 12 to the bottom line of your tax 13 form and subtract two thousand 14 dollars. After you've figured out 15 your taxes, you can scratch two 16 thousand dollars off if you have 17 two children, one thousand for 18 one child. Next year it will be 19 twelve hundred per child. Okay? 20 And I'm not even talking in this 21 example head of household or dependant deductions, which are 22 23 figured inside the body of the tax 24 form.

If you took the twelve

1 thousand dollars, which is the 2 obligation, and subtracted two 3 thousand that you get back in 4 child tax credit, you have a total 5 obligation of ten thousand 6 dollars, which is precisely, you know, what the guideline says. 8 That's the amount that each 9 parent owes, would owe with this 10 obligation. And so that 11 drastically reduces that pro rata 12 share, their burden of tax, their 13 burden of child support. No one 14 is taking any money away from 15 the children. It's all the same. 16 It's a zero sum gain.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If you don't like that option, then change it every other year and alternate it. But somehow or another, this state and these guidelines need to take this into account. A simplistic view of this, ignoring these changes is not fair and equitable.

Lastly, gross income. This

1 study related back -- PSI's study is related back to gross income, 2 3 even though the basis data for 4 this is net income data. The 5 people who do these studies 6 probably knew something about why they wanted to use net 8 income data, but nonetheless, this 9 study is on gross. If you do that 10 and you use that -- and I'll give 11 you an example here of someone 12 in the room. People like Mr. 13 Smith who have already testified. 14 You're making it to a point where 15 they cannot contribute to things 16 like 401(k) plans, which are sixty 17 to seventy percent of Alabama 18 retirement plans nowadays. 19 Okay? They don't have the 20 income to put in before-tax 21 dollars to do this because they get no credit for it. We are 22 23 basically penalizing them in 24 keeping them off of that. And 25 that's true for custodial and

noncustodial parents. It goes both ways.

Based on these concerns, you know, I think it's worth looking at going to a net income. I don't have all the answers on how to make that fair and right, but I think it makes sense. We don't want people who don't have money for retirement simply because they've been divorced and have children. That's not a reasonable way to proceed. Yet, that is where we are, particularly for middle and low income people.

Certification of this support schedule has significant responsibility, and you have a very difficult job. And I appreciate your time for listening to us. However, I want you to consider your responsibilities very carefully. The guidelines that come out of here need to adequately support our children

1 first and foremost. But they must 2 be fair and equitable, and that's 3 not an unreasonable request. And I think that's your goal. You're 4 5 good people, and you mean well 6 or you wouldn't be here, just like we are. But we also must promote 8 equitable, fair financial help for 9 both noncustodial and custodial 10 parents. Our state has funding 11 12 problems as it is. We don't want

Our state has funding problems as it is. We don't want to add to the welfare rolls now, do we? But that's part of what the scope is of what you're considering.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, if you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: What is your definition of net income?

MR. MASSEY: I didn't hear

COMMITTEE MEMBER: What is your definition of net income?

MR. MASSEY: Net income.

There are different definitions of it. You can use -- And I'm not pretending to give you that answer. Net income is what I have, what comes in my paycheck.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I
understand. I mean, you can see
what we have to wrestle with.
Because say you're just a
(inaudible) where you have to pay
union dues, yet compared to
someone else in an open shop
where you don't have to pay union
dues. Therefore, there's a
distinction there where you can
say those in a closed shop pay -their net income --

MR. MASSEY: Well, I don't mean to evade your answer. I'm not trying to be evasive. Betson-Rothbarth is based on -- the foundation of this study is based on net income numbers, yet this study didn't tell me what they did

```
1
      there. Okay? You know, I don't
2
      have that kind of data. I don't
3
      have that time to research it. I
4
      could get it for you. However, I
5
      think there are portions, just like
6
      child support -- Day care costs
      were factored into this study.
8
      Okay? I mean, that's something
9
      that is factored in the PSI study.
10
      You can factor in things like
11
      corporate retirement plans and
12
      other things that you deem
13
      important. Union dues? I don't
14
      -- I can't answer that question
15
      for you. Health care costs are
16
      also factored into this study.
17
      But, like I say, retirement
18
      changes, which makes up the vast
19
      majority of the retirement plans
20
      in this state, are not factored
21
      into this study. Medical
      accounts, before-tax-dollar
22
23
      medical accounts, flex meds, not
24
      factored into this. Okay? We --
25
      I'm sure you use those. Use them
```

to good advantage. We need to make it where everybody can. And if people are operating the margins of their income to meet their financial obligations to meet Rule 32, that's not the best for this state. It's not the best for those children. It's not what you intend either.

If you want, I can research it further and get back to you. I apologize. I didn't come --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Some

people consider net income to be

(inaudible) state and local tax.

Others consider whether it's

union dues which are compulsory

(inaudible).

MR. MASSEY: From my

perspective, that's -- you know,

that's fine, and you can include

it. I don't have a problem with

that because that's what it costs

that person to work. I mean, if

that's what it costs for you to

earn a living wage, okay? I

mean, we have to pay our taxes.

We have to pay for medical

insurance, at an increasing rate I

might add. All of us are being

hit by that.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: What you're saying is net income is take-home pay.

MR. MASSEY: That's what I

-- That's the easiest way. And I
believe based on what I've read
in here, given I only got the
report on Friday, that's pretty
close to what Betson-Rothbarth
looked at. But I don't have that
report in all its details to tell
you.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: And this might not be the time to get into it, but basically on -- Judge Ford, on one study or one plan that I seen takes into account -- First off, you don't -- Even if one of the parents is remarried or

1 both parents are remarried, 2 whatever, what you do to 3 establish is you don't take takehome pay because I personally --4 5 I claim a lot of dependants so 6 they don't take as much out on me because I would rather get mine 8 every two weeks as I had filing, 9 you know, and letting the 10 government use it for free for 11 twelve months. So all that really 12 matters is what you claim when it 13 comes time to file your taxes on 14 that. But the study that I'm 15 referring to, you take both 16 parents. You consider them as 17 individuals. Then you take their 18 incomes. You figure out what the federal -- and I'm just -- the 19 20 study just uses federal taxes --21 what your federal tax level for a 22 single individual at that income 23 level would be, figure out what 24 his taxes is. You can either 25 deduct it then and divide by

1 twelve, or figure out what the 2 taxes are and divide it by twelve 3 and then take -- whether you take 4 it from a monthly basis or an 5 annual basis is irrelevant. But 6 you'll eventually end up what, according to the federal law, the 8 federal tax law, this person would 9 end up with after taxes on income 10 that they are using because what 11 you -- I understand where the 12 concern is. Are we looking 13 union dues or are we -- You know, 14 you may have somebody -- We've 15 got people joining -- you know, 16 putting extra money in retirement 17 or got people joining the union to lower their net income and all 18 like that. So what you do is you 19 20 take away anything other than 21 what the federal tax code calls 22 for you to pay. And actually 23 you're crediting what the taxes 24 are. Net income is income less 25 taxes that you, you know, that

you would pay.

MR. MASSEY: Just for point of clarification, if you look at the fourth sheet I pulled directly out of the report, it says:

Schedule derivations statistical concerns continued. What this report looks at, all the income is treated as earned income. Okay?

It doesn't matter where it comes from.

Now, what it doesn't do, also, is handle any kind of capital losses. That happens nowadays. The stock market hurt a lot of people. But you don't get any reductions for loss. Okay. It's income, based on income, what comes in. Not your losses. Very simplistic.

All income assumed to be earned by the noncustodial parent with no dependant children, that's what's in this PSI study.

These are their assumptions, not

mine. Only adjustments for federal and state taxes and FICA are considered. For federal taxes, it's -- two withholdings are assumed. That's for -- I should have put it in there. That's for the custodial parent. For state taxes, one personal and one standard deduction are assumed. That's what this data is based on. Gives you a pretty good gross income with no allowances for reductions or changes.

We talked about overtime a few minutes ago. That's earned income, okay? When you don't earn that bonus, when you don't earn that, you have to go back into court and ask for an adjustment because that's not something that you got. But in the year that you had your child support readjusted or the time when the divorce actually

occurred, that was your income.

Unfortunately, in this economy in this day, it's hard to sustain those kinds of overtime hours.

It's hard to sustain those kinds of bonuses that may have happened five years ago.

Yes, ma'am?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: If I understand it, you would like to reduce the child support by whatever amount the parent chooses to put into a 401(k) or --

MR. MASSEY: No, ma'am, I

don't -- I'm not here suggesting

that you reduce child support at

all. What I am suggesting is that

has to be a factor in considering

the guidelines table.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: But if
you use -- Instead of using a
gross amount, let's say the person
makes a hundred thousand dollars
a year. And because they deduct
these (inaudible) deduct their

```
1
      health insurance (inaudible) their
2
      401(k), then they're not paying
3
      what is not considered the taxes
4
      but just those two things, they
5
      wind up having a hundred dollars
6
      less (inaudible) so ten percent
      less. So you would -- Your
8
      suggestion would be that the
9
      consideration of the (inaudible)
10
      would be ten percent less than it
11
      is today.
12
          MR. MASSEY: I would say --
13
      Let me try it this way --
14
          COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well,
15
      is that correct or incorrect?
16
          MR. MASSEY: It's not
17
      correct. It's not precisely
18
      correct, and let me explain why.
19
      And it's not just the noncustodial
20
      parent.
21
          COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well, I
22
      know, either way.
23
          MR. MASSEY: It's the
24
      custodial parent's and
25
      noncustodial parent's income
```

1 combined. Okay? That's what we 2 would be looking at. And the 3 reason I can't agree or disagree 4 with what you say is that the 5 basis of this study, the net 6 income study that was -- that all 7 this data is based on, 8 theoretically what they've done is 9 they took the net income level. 10 They decreased it by twenty 11 percent because of Alabama's low 12 income compared to the national 13 average, okay? Then they made 14 that equivalent to some gross 15 income level. You see? I don't 16 know how they went from net down 17 and then back to gross to be able 18 to tell you whether this is a 19 deduction or reduction or 20 anything else because that could 21 have easily been factored into the 22 original net income study that 23 was done. 24 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well,

what I'm trying to understand

1	from you is are you using the
2	example of a retirement system.
3	So I think what some of the other
4	judges are suggesting that using
5	net income and then just take
6	away paying taxes, state and
7	federal, that that's one way to
8	look at that. But as I understand
9	(inaudible) also include
10	consideration as to retirement and
11	cafeteria plans taken off the top.
12	MR. MASSEY: Yes. I think
13	you have to if you're going for a
14	net number.
15	COMMITTEE MEMBER: How
16	would that not then reduce the
17	Why would you not argue that the
18	child is then having to help
19	subsidize the retirement plan of
20	t h e
21	(Whereupon, several people
22	began speaking
23	simultaneously.)
24	MR. MASSEY: Well, they're

going to anyway whether we like

it or not. I mean, we all have elderly parents and --

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

validity.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I'm talking about the minor child.

MR. MASSEY: I understand. But this is a life-long thing. And the reason I cannot tell you or agree yes or no with you is what's fundamental is what's in the Betson-Rothbarth study. If that net income study took into account things like the cafeteria plans, took into account flex med, 401(k), it's all legal. There's no change. Okay. If it did not, then what you're supposing could be exactly correct. The problem is there's not enough data here for any of us to know. That's why I say please have this thing reviewed by people who can understand it and give you professional academic opinions about its

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Who would that be in the State of 2 3 Alabama? 4 MR. MASSEY: Well, sir, I 5 think we have University of 6 Alabama, Huntsville, Tuscaloosa, Auburn. We have wonderful 8 schools of economics. We have 9 Ph.D. professors there. I think 10 we can review this very easily. I 11 know Auburn has a wonderful 12 statistics department. They can 13 guide you very easily. 14 COMMITTEE MEMBER: I 15 believe all of the major 16 universities were asked to 17 propose to do this very study. 18 None of them -- $M\ R\ .\quad M\ A\ S\ S\ E\ Y\ :\qquad A\ n\ d\quad I$ 19 20 appreciate that. I've heard that. 21 That's why I'm suggesting here 22 instead of going back and trying 23 to get them to do something they

refused to do the first time, have

them review what's been done for

24

you. Have them review it and say
is this mathematically sound, is
this economically sound for this
state. Now, that's a little
different question, I think, than
asking them to go do the study.

JUDGE GOSA: Thank you, sir.

MR. MASSEY: Thank you very much.

JUDGE GOSA: Mollianne
Massey?

MOLLIANNE MASSEY: My
name is Mollianne Massey. I'm
married to Ed. I'm his second
wife, and he's my second husband.
We live in Madison County. I'm
the mother of two children who
have reached their majority. I
was the custodial parent. I'm the
stepmother of Andy and Ashley,
who are Ed's children by his first
marriage. I'm a grandmother very
proudly of Malcolm and Sean.

I have looked at child support as a parent who has received it

and as a parent who is helping to provide it and as a grandmother of one who has not received child support for over three years.

My first comments are prepared, and I would like to read them. They concern Judge Crawley's suggestions regarding the revision of Rule 32, and a number of things come to concern. His comments here relate only the financial penalties of failure to comply with disclosure of income and providing documentation of income required by Rule 32 and not to the requirement (inaudible) of information itself.

First, it puts a financial strain on an already tense situation. In many cases, financial problems within the marriage led to or significantly contributed to the divorce. Then comes the added financial strain caused by physical relocation of

one or both spouses and the added burden of new power bills, gas, rent, telephone bills, and similar expenses, which must be duplicated when one household becomes two. Add to that the cost of attorney's fees, court costs, and the expenses relating to obtaining the divorce itself, adding on two people struggling to readjust their lifestyles while still providing for their children's needs.

Judge Crawley's proposal, while having an understandable basis, ends up being punitive and can only add further unnecessary stress and strain to the process.

To add Judge Crawley's language to Rule 32 makes Rule 32 punitive in nature, and that never was and is not now the intent of Rule 32.

The Rule is designed to reasonably apportion financial responsibility for children

between their parents.

The trial courts already have the ability to enter orders related to discovery and to enter sanctions under the Alabama Rules of Civil Procedure for failure to comply with discovery. This is a matter best left to the discretion of the trial judge to handle under the rules of procedure which already exist.

Second, Judge Crawley's suggested revision makes no room for delays caused by busy attorneys who simply don't get their client's documentation filed timely. It is possible that a thirty-day delay could cost an additional four hundred to eight hundred dollars, money which could and should be spent to satisfy the needs of children of divorced parents.

I might add that in Madison

County, the disclosure was

1 required on us at one point in 2 January of 1998. Our court case 3 didn't happen until July of 1999. 4 Thirty days to disclose that 5 information. We did it in a timely manner. And our courts 6 are so backed up that it was 8 eighteen months before we went to 9 court, and the documentation was 10 irrelevant at that point. 11

Everyone's income had changed.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In financially penalizing parents, the Rule could also penalize the children. How could a parent who's being required by the trial court to pay money (inaudible) continue to take their children to the zoo or to McDonald's, or to a movie, or shopping to buy new cleats for baseball or an Easter dress or even for school supplies?

In closing, Rule 32 was not meant to be punitive and should not have punitive measures in it. Rule 32 is a rule of judicial administration. It creates guidelines for trial courts to use, standardizing child support obligations throughout the state.

Judge Crawley's suggestion, at least as far as the punitive aspect of failure to comply with the same, is a rule of civil procedure and not appropriate for consideration by this body or inclusion of Rule 32.

I urge that while you may support the documentation requirements that Judge Crawley has proposed, please do not support the punitive measures included in this proposal.

On a personal note, I would like to say that I have been in the trenches. My ex-husband left me. I met -- after some time and some healing, met Ed Massey, and we eventually married. He was custodial parent of his two

children at that point in time. I

took on a new family along with

mine, which was almost

(inaudible). And when that

happened, his ex-wife took him to

court, and after seven years, got

a reversal of custody. I saw what

a travesty our -- and I'm going to

put it into quotes -- our justice

system is. That may not happen

in any of your courtrooms, but in

Madison County, it does.

I grew up in a very patriotic family. I pay my taxes. I go to church. I sing in the choir. I play the piano for the children's choir. I used to believe in the system, but after being in the trenches of family court for now, I guess, going on nine years with myself, with my dear husband, and watching my daughter trying to receive child support -- she lives in public housing and after three years, she still has not gotten

any. And DHR's answer to her is,

It's not enough money for us to

go after. I help supply a lot of

things for my grandchildren as

well as helping support my

stepchildren and trying to help

my own children as I can.

I don't believe in the justice system anymore. There's been a lot of publicity about trying to take the words under God out of the Pledge of Allegiance. I don't say the Pledge of Allegiance anymore. I have a son who's in the air force and would willingly give his life for this country, and I cannot make myself say the pledge to our flag because it says, With justice for all.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is not justice for all, at least not in the State of Alabama and at least not in Madison County.

When people like me and Ed and the other members of ALFRA

1 become so separated from what we 2 thought our fundamental rights 3 were as citizens of the state and of this country, when justice 4 5 becomes so far removed from us 6 and we don't believe in the system anymore, at some point, 8 the system is going to come 9 crumbling down. And we have no 10 one to blame but ourselves 11 because of the numerous injustice 12 on top of injustice that our court 13 system and we ourselves have 14 allowed to be laid upon us. 15 Thank you. 16 JUDGE GOSA: Thank you, 17 ma'am. COMMITTEE MEMBER: I have 18 19 a question. Can we get a copy of 20 you -- your presentation? 21 MRS. MASSEY: Some of it was 22 just from my heart. I'm sorry. 23 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Thank 24 you. It will be on film.

JUDGE GOSA: Woodrow Sims?

1 WOODROW SIMS: Excuse me, 2 sir. I am here and prepared to 3 speak, but it's come to my attention that someone who's 4 5 speaking after me needs to leave 6 as soon as possible. I was wondering if possibly we could switch. 8 JUDGE GOSA: Sure. Who is 9 10 that? MR. SIMS: Ms. Jones. 11 12 JUDGE GOSA: Come ahead, 13 ma'am. Kristen Jones? 14 KRISTEN JONES: Would y'all like a copy? Also, I have some 15 16 comparative sheets here where it 17 has a schedule, a guideline, 18 whatever you want to call it, of gross income and of net income. 19 20 The names are fake, but the 21 income is real. I had to change 22 the names, of course. The 23 university has that policy. 24 And just to define net income,

because I've heard several people

1 who have several different 2 definitions, at the university we 3 define net income as federal, state, local, and FICA taxes. 4 The 5 401(k), union dues, we do not 6 consider that. So when you see those numbers, those were the 8 things that were subtracted out. 9 And that's just to kind of show 10 you the difference between if someone were to pay child support 11 12 based on their net income versus 13 paying child support based upon 14 their gross income.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: What did you say the factors you considered were? Did you say federal is one?

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

 $M\,S$. JONES: Federal taxes, state and local taxes, and FICA taxes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: You said that, but everybody's tax situation is different depending on charitable contributions and

all the other things. It's never the same even from year to year.

MS. JONES: Yes, I understand that. And, of course, we have to take that into consideration. We just used one couple that had divorced, their W-2 forms, and then, of course, from that point we split it, you know, into twelve months.

that would apply only for that year, that tax year, also. It wouldn't be valid as to any other year, even as to that couple.

That's the problem I see with that. We don't know what a person's taxes are going to be until the year is over.

MS. JONES: Yes, sir.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: You said there were two. I think I only count one.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I've got the other one.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER: I'm 2 sorry. That's fine. But when you 3 did this, did you apply the same schedule to both? Did you apply 4 the same schedule to both? 5 6 MS. JONES: Did I apply the same schedule --8 COMMITTEE MEMBER: 9 Schedule, table. 10 MS. JONES: Yes, ma'am. 11 COMMITTEE MEMBER: You 12 understand that the table assumes one or the other (inaudible) --13 MS. JONES: Yes, ma'am. I 14 15 didn't have another -- Of course, 16 since we're not using the net 17 income at this point, I didn't 18 have another schedule to use. So I'm just kind of using that as a 19 20 basic guideline. I'm sorry. We 21 take all those things into consideration. I was just trying 22 23 to maybe numerically give you an 24 idea of what the difference is. 25 That was the basic point of me

1 doing the comparative sheets. 2 COMMITTEE MEMBER: 3 mentioned the university. Where 4 are you from? 5 MS. JONES: I actually live in 6 Gadsden, Alabama, but I'm a senior at the University of 8 Alabama in Huntsville. 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Okay. 10 That's Etowah County. COMMITTEE MEMBER: I have 11 12 a question. Do you represent a 13 noncustodial parent or a custodial parent? 14 15 MS. JONES: Well, in my 16 presentation, I was going to say that. I don't. I've just -- I've 17 been doing research for the past 18 19 three years. I don't have 20 children. I don't receive child 21 support, nor do I pay child 22 support. I sit on the Alabama 23 Fatherhood Initiative Steering

Committee in Etowah County. So

I have done a lot of research.

24

But like I said, for the last three or four years, I have been to child support court weekly, and I've seen what goes on and what happens. So that's (inaudible).

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Let me ask if -- According to Her Honor's question over there, I think Alabama assumes a gross income. So the table would apply to both accounts because what she is doing is she is reducing the amount of income that's being used to a net income level. Therefore, you would use the same table to go and receive this benefit. What you're doing is --Before you're saying let's use thirty thousand dollars and the table says you owe this much. This time you're saying we'll use twenty-seven thousand dollars we'll use this much and all so --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I understand. It's just not valid.

MS. JONES: I understand. was just trying to give you numerically an idea of what the difference would be monthly, you know, when he would pay this much. Either the noncustodial parent would pay this much or then the noncustodial parent would pay this much based on gross or net. I was just -- I know it's not valid. I was just trying to numerically maybe give you an idea of what it would look like if that was implemented into the policy.

My policy concern, of course, is that child support guidelines reflect gross income or should it reflect net income as the basis to set the amount of child support that a noncustodial parent is to pay. For clarification, again, I view net income as federal, state and local, and FICA taxes withheld from the paycheck.

Like I said before, I'm

completely nonbiased. I'm here

to present my research

observations that I've made for

the past three years as a political
science student at the University

of Alabama in Huntsville.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My first question is, should child support guidelines reflect net income as the basis to set the amount of child support that noncustodial parent should pay. believe yes, that this should be based upon net income. The concept behind the guidelines is what would the child have received if the parents were not divorced. If they had stayed together, what would that child receive. And in saying that, a parent inside a marriage can only support their children with what they bring home. Obviously, a parent cannot support their child with what is withheld from their

paycheck. And there again, I'm not talking about union dues or 401(k). A child should not have to support that. But the government does own those taxes. You don't own those taxes.

This same concept should apply to divorced parents as well. A noncustodial parent cannot support his or her children with what they don't have, with what they don't bring home. The amount of child support a noncustodial parent should pay should be based on net income.

Set the amount of child support may not make a large difference numerically. It may not even answer the overwhelming problem with child support collection.

And I deal with that. I know that it's a huge problem in this state, and I know it's not going to answer that problem. But it's the

most plausible, the most common sense, and the most fair means of collecting this -- of calculating child support as opposed to using gross income.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The flipside of that, someone could ask, Well, should we use gross income to base child support. Some argue that this proposal is the most fair. Some argue that it's the most uncomplicated. Maybe it is the most uncomplicated, but I've never heard through my research and observations -- maybe y'all can tell me something else -- I've never heard anything in doing this any arguments that are legitimate to base child support on gross income.

In closing, I would just like
to say that for the sake of a more
legitimate government that
reflects policy making that is
fair, for the sake of the people

1 of Alabama, I beg this committee to take my policy concerns into 2 3 consideration. 4 Anybody have any questions? 5 JUDGE GOSA: Any questions? 6 Thank you, ma'am. We have a twenty-minute break 8 scheduled. With your permission, we'll limit that to ten minutes 9 10 unless somebody needs longer. 11 Let's just take a break for about 12 ten minutes. (Whereupon, a brief recess 13 was had, after which the 14 15 proceedings continued as 16 f o 1 1 o w s:) 17 WOODROW SIMS: My name is Woodrow Sims. I live in 18 19 Florence, Alabama, which is 20 Lauderdale County. I'm a small 21 businessman and a member of the 22 Alabama Family Rights 23 Association.

I would first like to thank

everyone on this committee for

24

the opportunity to come and speak. I understand the importance of continually reviewing Rule 32, and I believe that together we can conceive some creative ideas that will benefit everyone.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I heard Mr. Harbin speak -- I mean, not Mr. Harbin -- Mr. Massey speak on the intricacies of the PSI report as well as Mr. Hicks on some very interesting details of the child support rules. I will be honest. While I'm here to speak, I (unintelligible). I don't fully understand everything they are talking about. So I'm going to stick to what I understand and what I can conceive as to what some problems might be as far as collecting the data and some other issues, the two major points.

I'm going to start out by

just to ponder over. How many of you can accurately tell me what your auto expense will be for the next month, that includes gas, windshield wipers, washing the car, any of those such things?

How many of you can tell me what your auto expense will be the entire year? How many of you can tell me how much food expense you will have with your husband or wife for the entire next year?

It's safe to say that most

people in this room are probably

well prepared for those type of

questions and might be able to

actually provide some answers. I

know for myself personally, I

know how many quarters I give my

daughter for the (unintelligible)

machine every month. But not

everybody -- and I assume that

the average American will not be

1 able to do that.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

However, this is how the data is collected for creating the formula. It is nothing more than guesses, estimations, ideas of what people think they spend on their children every year, not actual data.

Now, in my business, I actually go through the process of changing businesses from using estimations to actually using real-time data. I can tell you that they are amazed every time you do it to see exactly how wrong they were. And I wouldn't be very surprised that if we did the same thing here, we wouldn't see the exact same result, the amazement of actually the difference between the proposed idea and the actuality of the data.

So one more question. How do we get real data on what it takes

to support a child? I think that the most accurate way to do this is to institute the EBT card.

That would be using an Electronic Benefit Transfer using a debit card to give to all noncustodial parents for the ability for them to access their child support.

For proof of success of this system, one just has to go look at the food stamp department. They boast about how successful it's been, how easily it was deployed, and the low cost of implementation that it took.

They also say that the amount of fraudulent activities associated with food stamps has declined by two thirds.

The EBT is a viable solution
to our problem of having accurate
data to create the child support
formula. We can guarantee that
every child that depends on child
support for survival will see the

most appropriate amount to aid in the cost of daily upbringing of the child.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm going to move on to point two. Over the recent past, there has been several attempts to increase the percent of noncustodial parents that are paying child support. I agree with this initiative wholeheartedly. I disagree with some of the methods to do this. But every noncustodial parent that refuses to pay child support or every noncustodial parent that flees to another country to avoid being prosecuted for such is a -allows the stigma to be placed in the minds of Americans that every noncustodial parent, including myself, have to overcome in daily life, parents that want to have an ongoing relationship with his or her children and that want to create a stable financial

environment for them to grow up in healthy homes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

All right. Back to the budgets. Governor Siegelman recently tried a lost dogs campaign. This campaign spent ten times the amount of money that -- and actually was credited for receiving child support. DHR released a report from our county in Lauderdale saying that it spent one dollar thirty-four cents for every one dollar child support that it collected. Now, you don't have to be Bill Gates to figure out that this is just not productive endeavors.

Here I have a cost-effective idea that will increase the percentage of child support collected creating incentives for paying child support. Incentives are generally a better way to get the most unlikely candidates to participate.

I would suggest that we split the child tax credit. I want to emphasize split, not shift, not change, but split. I understand the custodial parents have a burden of taking care of the child, and I do not want to take away from their benefit. However, the noncustodial parent is given the same burden of trying to raise the child financially. And as such, if they do that successfully, they should have the tax benefit just as the custodial parent does.

My proposal suggests that
giving a tax credit up to fifty

percent of the total credit to the
noncustodial parent if they are up
to date with their child support

payments, if they can prove
either money order receipts, if
they can prove child check stubs
where it's taken out of their

paycheck, either one of those two

things, have it attached, then
they can receive up to fifty

percent of the child tax credit.

If he or she only paid fifty

percent of the child support that
year, then they would only be
eligible for a twenty-five percent
tax credit.

I know this is a big idea, and it's not going to be easily implemented. Considering the cost compared to other child support collection efforts, this is one that would be miniscule and might still yield the best results.

In conclusion, I think both these issues are positive, healthy changes to Rule 32 that benefit children involved. It's well worth any effort or cost to insure the well-being of our future generations because they are America's best resource.

I once again would like to thank you for your time in

1	presenting these ideas. I look
2	forward to working with you in
3	the implantation process.
4	Is there any questions?
5	COMMITTEE MEMBER:
6	(Inaudible) federal tax laws
7	(inaudible).
8	MR. SIMS: I wouldn't think
9	so because Once again, I'm
10	just a guy trying to brainstorm
11	here. And it's a good point.
12	COMMITTEE MEMBER:
13	(Inaudible.)
14	MR. SIMS: But Rule 32 does
15	determine who gets the credit, if
16	I'm not mistaken. It does make a
17	determination as such.
18	COMMITTEE MEMBER: That
19	can be done in the decree,
20	Divorce Decree because
21	COMMITTEE MEMBER: I don't
22	deal with that in Divorce
23	Decrees.
24	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Even if
25	you do that, the parent who

claims that child, if they are audited, they have to prove to the IRS that they provided more than fifty percent of the support. So we can't change the rule here that would force somebody to violate federal law.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: No, sir, but what I'm saying is if it was mandated in the divorce that I receive the tax credit for the children due to the fact that the mother did not work and it wouldn't benefit her and all to have it and all so --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well,
the problem you have with
(inaudible) if someone violates
the decree, the Internal Revenue
Service is not bound by it.
They'll penalize you (inaudible)
the Internal Revenue Service
(inaudible) alternative they have
is contempt in circuit court
(inaudible) not only a penalty but

a (inaudible).

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I have done that and also ordered the custodial parent to sign the necessary forms. There's an IRS form -- I don't recall the number -- that allows that. And I have done that, but that still doesn't change the federal law. Also, on the debit card argument, you're comparing trucks and wagons there.

MR. SIMS: How so?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Food stamps are for food only, and it's been misstated here several times to day that child support has to be used directly for the child when that's never been the law. It can be used indirectly for electricity, for other heating and cooling, water, for house payments, all these things because the child has to live, too. So it's not just a direct payment.

MR. SIMS: I would agree with that.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: A debit card would not satisfy that because you can't make a mortgage payment with a child support debit card and a thousand other things that mamas and daddies have to do.

MR. SIMS: I would agree with that, and that's a good point.

And I think we could actually give them something that would allow them to withdraw out of an ATM machine up to twenty-five, maybe thirty percent of the debit card to handle those types of expenses. I understand that things do come up that they will not be able to pay with the debit card.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: That would still put it on a cash basis, the twenty-five percent --

MR. SIMS: But at least that

would get it on the track, up to
seventy percent of what's going
on. I mean, it's a lot better than
what we have now.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: In defense of your position there, all I have to say is the State of Georgia is already using debit cards. It became effective January of this year. So I think if the State of Georgia can do it, surely we can find a way to do it, also. So it's not an impossible thing.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I think
you would need to look at what
the experience is after a year or
two to see if it's really meeting
the objective.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I agree with you but with one exception.

We don't have another year or two to study these guidelines. I think these things are going to be decided very shortly, and we have

to make a decision within that
time or we'll lose another window
of opportunity. It could be
another eighteen years.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: It's up to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court will decide. We don't know what they're going to do. We're just advisory. The Supreme Court has to decide (inaudible).

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I hope you're right, and I hope they give us time to do a good job on this.

MR. SIMS: I want to say something else, too. Things like utility bills, phone bills, cable bills, car payments, all those things now generated with the wonderful moving forward of technology usually are being able to be paid for by the debit card. I actually pay all my -- The only thing I can't pay myself personally is my car.

Unfortunately, we're not that advanced in the (inaudible). We have one elevator in the capitol. (Inaudible).

JUDGE GOSA: Anything else?
Thank you, sir.

Michael Harbin?

MICHAEL HARBIN: Hello.

I'm Michael Harbin, and thank

you for allowing me to come here

for a few moments and speak to

the committee.

I do not agree with the way
the child support is due based on
a gross income. I've been
divorced a little over a year and
a half. Last year I paid roughly
twenty-eight thousand in child
support, another thirty-three
thousand in alimony, about
another ten thousand in
miscellaneous expenditures.

The way the child support was figured in my case was based on

1 m
2 b
3 t
4 e
5 o
6 I
7 i
8 B

my previous income several years back. We were showing evidence to the court, based on the current economic environment which we operated in my business because I'm self-employed, that my income had dropped substantially. But I was still taxed based on my old income levels.

I think the guidelines need to be changed. I think it's in the best interest of the children that they are changed. And in my case, I'm not here to say I'm a mad dad or I don't want to pay. I do want to pay. I do want to pay. I upport my children.

I have to drive to Atlanta to see my children. My former wife lives with her fiancé in his house without having a job. Her -- She's not working while I'm funding this large amount of money every month.

Last year, my gross income

was only sixty-three thousand dollars. To make up that difference, I liquidated my retirement and my 401(k) for fear of going to jail that my former wife is constantly threatening through her attorney.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I continue to pay my child support, continue to pay the medical expenses, and I'll continue to do so. How? I don't know, but I will because I love my children. But taking gross income and not subtracting your taxes and coming up with an average on the table, say X, Y and you intersect, well, mine was up here. But up here was five and six years ago. This is what I make today. This is what I can pay, and this is what I'll continue to pay. And if I can make more, I'll pay more because I love my children and I want the very best for them.

But right now, the rules in Alabama are wrong. The system is broken. It needs to be repaired. I'll help the committee, and I'll help the Alabama Family Rights Association. I'll do whatever I can to help what's in the best interest of the children and for the noncustodial parent such as myself because I have to eat, too, and the custodial parent.

This is a good committee.

Some smart folks on here. I know y'all can make a change that will be positive and good for the people of Alabama, but most importantly for the children. But I personally cannot maintain a lifestyle for myself which is very meager under these old guidelines.

So that's all I have to say. I don't have anything prepared.

You may ask questions.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER: What 2 county are you from? 3 MR. HARBIN: Montgomery. 4 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Have 5 you tried to modify your child 6 support? 7 MR. HARBIN: We are in the 8 process of trying to modify that 9 The courts -- The court 10 came back and said that I had far 11 greater capability given my 12 income back to its previous 13 levels than it is right now. I 14 don't know how I'm going to do 15 that. If you're familiar with my 16 company Harbin's, Incorporated 17 over here on Perry Street, I 18 finally pulled the plug, and you 19 can see we're having a 20 liquidation sale. We're losing 21 money left and right. But, yes, 22 we're trying to modify the child 23 support. 24 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Do you

favor a system that adjusted your

child support based upon the
income set on a quarterly or
semi-annual basis? (Inaudible.)

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HARBIN: I certainly would. In my case, you know, I was an open book. I know a lot of people, suddenly your income starts to dry up, a doctor not seeing many patients, a lawyer's billable hours start to drop. Mine is based on sales, and I can't hide sales. And, again, it was based upon the court's determination that I can get my income back to its previous levels. I can show the court today, which we are doing, but I don't know if it's going to modify it or not. If it's not, I'll just have to make due.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: You said you paid approximately over maybe seventy thousand dollars out in child support and alimony and miscellaneous last year.

1 MR. HARBIN: Seventy-four thousand. 2 3 COMMITTEE MEMBER: What 4 was your net after the legitimate taxes? 5 6 MR. HARBIN: My net adjusted gross income on my tax return was 8 about thirty-eight thousand. 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER: No, no. 10 After deducting FICA, federal, 11 state, and local taxes. 12 MR. HARBIN: It was around 13 forty-three thousand. 14 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Okay. 15 So you went in the hole twenty 16 thousand dollars? Do you have 17 any reason to question the wisdom 18 of your wife who wants you dealing with the style 19 20 (inaudible)? 21 MR. HARBIN: Do I have -- I 22 have no idea about any of it. It 23 totally blows my mind. The whole 24 doggone deal cost me a hundred

and fifty thousand in legal fees.

1	I have to pay her attorney's fees
2	and mine.
3	COMMITTEE MEMBER: A
4	hundred and fifty thousand?
5	MR. HARBIN: Yes.
6	COMMITTEE MEMBER: I
7	should go back to practicing law.
8	(Whereupon, several people
9	began speaking
10	simultaneously.)
11	MR. HARBIN: Then about
12	another half a million in assets.
13	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Was
14	that a settled case or did you try
15	it?
16	MR. HARBIN: No. She wanted
17	to go to court. The main thing
18	she wanted was sole custody, and
19	she got it. She has taken me to
20	court several times.
21	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Over
22	how what period of time?
23	MR. HARBIN: Three years.
24	Actually my case was the first
25	case to test a new law where the

276

```
1
      custodial parent -- My wife
2
      (inaudible) tried to bring her
      back in, and the judge said no.
3
         COMMITTEE MEMBER: You
4
5
      said a court indicated that you
6
      could increase your income or
      that you were voluntarily -- or
8
      that you had voluntarily
9
      attempted to decrease your
10
      income. Was there some objective
      data presented to the court to
11
12
      say, Well, look what the
13
      competition did in Montgomery
      County, You could have made X-
14
15
      amount of sales for this
16
      particular year? Or I'm just --
         COMMITTEE MEMBER: Before
17
      you answer that, Justice Stewart
18
      and Judge Crawley ought to --
19
         COMMITTEE MEMBER: Leave
20
21
      the room?
22
         COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well,
23
      if this case is ongoing, this
24
      could end up in their court.
```

MR. HARBIN: Well, this --

1	COMMITTEE MEMBER: If this
2	is an ongoing litigation, they
3	wouldn't be able to hear that. So
4	excuse me for interrupting there.
5	JUDGE GOSA: Thank you so
6	much. Thank you, sir.
7	MR. HARBIN: To help pay for
8	this child support, if you want to
9	come up for this liquidation sale
10	
11	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Mr.
12	Harbin, what do you sell?
13	MR. HARBIN: Office
14	furniture.
15	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Oh,
16	okay.
17	MR. HARBIN: Office furniture
18	and supplies.
19	COMMITTEE MEMBER:
20	(Inaudible.)
21	JUDGE GOSA: Mr. Smith?
22	James O. Smith? Sir, I don't
23	believe you were here this
24	morning. We have these in ten-
25	minute increments. And when you

have consumed eight minutes, I'll
give you a sign so you'll know
you have only got two more in
case you have something you want
to cover that you haven't covered
yet.

The bulk of my comments apply to my understanding of the proposed changes to Rules 32(e) and 32(f) of the Alabama Rules of Judicial Administration, which appear intended to (unintelligible) problem persistent in child support cases basically since the guidelines were established in 1987.

While present rules require
that parties provide the trial
court with information,
documentation concerning
compliance with the guidelines,
it's no real surprise to anyone
who practices law in this state

1 that in a large number of cases, 2 compliance with Rule 32 in that 3 respect is problematic to put it mildly. The failure --4 COMMITTEE MEMBER: I'm 5 6 sorry. But may I ask where you're from? 8 MR. SMITH: Here in 9 Montgomery. I'm sorry. 10 Actually, in Montgomery, they do 11 a good job. They do require it. 12 The judges are very -- I want to 13 make that point here. Judges 14 here in Montgomery are very 15 scrupulous about making sure that 16 those forms are in the files. 17 However, as I travel around the 18 state, I find it somewhat more problematic in some 19 20 juris dictions. 21 The failures to comply with 22 the rules makes it -- does make it 23 nearly impossible for the 24 appellate courts to review the

compliance of the guidelines.

And there have been a fair number of cases that the Court of Civil Appeals had to remand in simply because there wasn't the adequate record of the forms in the court file, which of course is a waste of not only the appellate court's time but it's a waste of the trial court's time to have to go back and revisit the issue.

But even worse than that, since most child support cases aren't appealed, there is little documentation in the file, and one can only surmise that the failure to provide that documentation means that child support order may very well not be accurately computed. This, of course, means that either children are being short-changed of the child support they are due or the noncustodial parent is being overburdened beyond his or her ability to pay support. And, of

course, when parents are overobligated to pay support, one
recourse they have is to be driven
into underground economy and
basically become invisible, which
serves no particular public
purpose and is ultimately, I
think, detrimental to the best
interest of the child.

While the proposed changes to Rule 32 I think are laudable, there are a couple of things I think would be advisable if they were improved or changed or taken into account.

One is that in cases where you have pro se representation -- and I'm particularly thinking of cases pursuant to the Protection from Abuse Act where child support is sought under the statute. In these cases, as I read the statute -- I mean, read the proposed rule, certainly it would require the filing of these -- of the forms

and the added documentation with potential for penalties that are suggested. I think that would be inappropriate. The -- I think one requiring the domestic violence victim who's fleeing for safety to have that documentation at the time of filing is probably unrealistic and if it delays filing a needed protection order, safety can certainly be compromised.

Furthermore, since the defendant in the case has a final hearing within fourteen days, the defendant would never have to file the forms because, one, no answer is required and, two, the final hearing would come before any forms would have to be filed.

I think -- In addition to that,

I think for the victim of domestic violence to have to disclose the -- at a very grueling point in the proceedings, the identity of the employer also poses potential

safety problems. While in most cases, the perpetrator of domestic violence may well know where the victim is working, there are certainly cases where that is not true. And I think that would pose a danger for that kind of disclosure to take place before adequate safeguards can be taken by the court. I think at the very least, the court ought to be allowed to waive this requirement upon the plaintiff showing cause or, you know, certainly seal the file, keep it for an in-camera inspection.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And beyond the cases of protection from abuse, I think that while -- Again, these requirements are great, and I think they work -- I think the proposed change will work very well where folks are represented by counsel. I think when you have pro se representing -- folks

1 proceeding pro se before the 2 court, it becomes a trap for the 3 unwary, particularly when you bring into play the penalty 4 5 provisions. I think that while 6 everyone -- I mean, I'm an attorney. I believe folks are 8 better off if they're represented 9 by counsel. Pro se representation 10 is here, and it's here to stay. 11 You know, we can't make it go 12 away. I think to place that kind 13 of a burden with those potential penalties on someone who's just 14 15 trying to represent themselves is 16 not appropriate. I believe that 17 this could potentially -- this 18 procedure -- proposed procedure 19 could potentially work to 20 everybody's advantages if it were 21 sort of, well, likened to Rule 11, you know, applied to cases where 22 23 there is counsel so counsel would 24 ultimately be responsible.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Are

you talking about Judge Crawley's proposal now?

MR. SMITH: Yeah, that is where this was headed. I mean, I think this is appropriate -- I think the sanctions are appropriate where folks are represented by counsel. I think where people are proceeding prose, I think it is --

(Whereupon, Videotape 3 ended and Videotape 4 began with Mr. Smith continuing as follows:)

MR. SMITH: -- standard that social security uses is that somebody has to be permanently and totally disabled. There's no fifty percent disabled. Either you are or you aren't a hundred percent totally disabled and incapable of performing work in the national economy. For a disabled person to nevertheless have to come back before the

```
1
      court and reprove, provide
2
      medical evidence to prove his
3
      disability, seems to be, again, a
      bit much. I think that folks who
4
5
      are disabled -- that the
6
      determination from social
      security ought to be dispositive
8
      of their disability. If they can
9
      prove to the court that they are,
10
      in fact, receiving ongoing
      disability benefits from the
11
12
      Social Security Administration,
13
      that ought to be the end of the
14
      analysis concerning their
15
      disability because beyond that,
16
      there really are no standards for
17
      disability other than the
18
      subjective view of each
19
      individual trial court judge.
20
          That's all I have. Thank you.
21
          COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jim,
22
      are you saying the state courts
23
      are inquiring as to whether or not
24
      -- inquiring into the validity of
25
      the social security disability
```

determination?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SMITH: They are inquiring in some cases, yeah. mean, they are going back underneath that determination and requiring in some cases that some folks -- and that's what social security says, I want -- the judge saying, I want you to reprove that to me, which is something, you know, if you're represented by counsel, maybe you can do. certainly is onerous. But for the pro se litigant coming to child support court, I mean, that's beyond their ability.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Okay.

What do you do now in your

practice when the other spouse

will not provide documentation

for income in order to protect

your spouse?

MR. SMITH: Where the other spouse won't -- For instance, in a default case, which is probably

the most common case, where the defendant gets served, you have personal service so you have no issue of jurisdiction, in personam jurisdiction and the court truly has it to establish the child support order but the person doesn't show up, I file something from my client giving my client's best guesstimate of what that person has made in the past while they were living together.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: What if the other spouse is represented by an attorney and they will not supply the documentation? Is that a common problem or a rare problem?

MR. SMITH: It's something that usually gets worked out. It would be nice, I think -- or if all -- if these documents -- If I understand your proposal, sir, is that these would be provided just as a matter of course up front in

the beginning of the case. I think that would be very helpful. I mean, everybody would know where they are going, you know, share it with your client at the very beginning. You know, if the client has problems about the documentation that has been provided, then you proceed with the necessary discovery. I think that's a very good idea.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Let me ask you this: I have a proposal you haven't seen that would require the plaintiff to file a CS-41 and documentation at the time the complaint is filed, and that the defendant would file his or hers at the time the answer was filed or it would prohibit the clerk from receiving those pleadings for filing unless they complied. What do you think about that approach?

MR. SMITH: I mean, I think

that would be -- Again, I think
that would be fine if, one, we
made the exception for pro se
litigants. I mean, again, there -you know --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Why do that? If a pro se filed -- brings a complaint to the clerk's office to file it and the clerk says, I can't accept this because it doesn't have the forms, they can go back and get it.

MR. SMITH: Well, let me rephrase my answer. I've watched -- Okay. This -- Obviously, what you're proposing, then, would mean that there would -- it would be unnecessary probably to have the -- for the most part, the financial penalties that are --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Every judge has had the problem you're talking about in getting lawyers to comply.

MR. SMITH: Yes, I'm well

1 aware of that.

COMMITTEE MEMBER:

(Inaudible) taking sides. It seems to me that you can (inaudible) a lot of these problems by employing a system like that.

MR. SMITH: Well, I mean, I think you could. There is -- One question would be in the current financial situation, which hopefully won't last forever, do we want the clerks to be burdened with having to make those decisions for, you know -- telling people and then having to explain to people what they need to get and what's going to be adequate. Maybe that's not appropriate.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Maybe if AOC prepared a brochure or something. I'm not advising you here. (Inaudible.) You know, if they can do a (inaudible).

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER: I'm 2 sympathetic to a lot of those 3 comments. We judges didn't pass a domestic violence law. In fact, 4 5 when it was originally proposed, 6 I wrote a multi-page analysis of it, and some revisions were made. 8 But we can't change that. I've 9 said that many times today. As 10 you know, that's statutory law, 11 and somebody other than us will 12 have to change that. But it does 13 need visiting, but that's not within our purview. 14 15 MR. SMITH: Okay. Well, in 16 any event, I see it as a problem, 17 and I see it as --18 COMMITTEE MEMBER: It is a 19 problem. 20 MR. SMITH: And anything 21 there that is going to delay a domestic violence victim, 22 23 particularly from getting a 24 protection from abuse order,

which most of which are filed pro

1 s e.

that's just going to delay your order because you don't have those forms with you because the domestic violence order is dealing with the violence, not child support. The child support is a secondary issue there. You can make sure the victim of domestic violence is being protected despite the fact whether they have forms to verify what child support --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: And who wants to (inaudible) that they want temporary child support, but if I don't have any basis to grant it, I don't grant it because we're going to have a hearing with fourteen days anyway. But most of them don't show up. And that's another --

MR. SMITH: There are a lot of issues obviously. And my

1	concern was where some If Rule
2	32 is to apply to a pro see
3	protection from abuse petition
4	where the petitioner is seeking
5	child support, then I see that as
6	a potential problem. If it
7	doesn't, then it's not a problem.
8	COMMITTEE MEMBER: The
9	problem is the statute on
10	domestic violence mandates child
11	support, you know, which brings
12	in Rule 32. But we can't change
13	that substantive law of Rule 32.
14	(Whereupon, several people
15	began speaking
16	simultaneously.)
17	COMMITTEE MEMBER:
18	particularly with the exparte
19	order. As Judge Gosa said, you
20	don't have to order support at
21	that time. You can wait until you
22	have the hearing.
23	COMMITTEE MEMBER: I
24	customarily don't.

 $C\ O\ M\ M\ I\ T\ T\ E\ E\quad M\ E\ M\ B\ E\ R\ :\qquad S\ o\quad y\ o\ u$

1 have a fourteen-day window 2 anyway. 3 MR. SMITH: I mean, I realize you don't have -- You know, 4 5 number one, the victim would have to ask for it. The court 6 doesn't have to order it. 8 However, wherever it is 9 appropriate, it seems to me that 10 the children ought to be able to 11 benefit from the child support 12 order at that early opportunity. 13 COMMITTEE MEMBER: I doubt if you're going to collect any 14 15 money. 16 MR. SMITH: Collection is 17 always a problem but (inaudible). 18 JUDGE GOSA: Any other questions? 19 20 MR. SMITH: Yes, sir? 21 COMMITTEE MEMBER: I heard 22 your comments about pro se 23 exceptions to filing the forms, 24 and I'm inclined to agree with

you because -- and I also heard

1 the comments from the committee 2 recognizing some problems with 3 that. (Inaudible). If he knows 4 enough to file a complaint, may be 5 he can get his income information 6 together and depend on the circuit clerk to tell him that. 8 It's been my experience in the 9 circuit clerk offices that they're 10 going to tell a pro se person that 11 they cannot advise them in the 12 law. I like your idea of just 13 giving out some kind of pamphlet, 14 but I don't think we can do that 15 inside this rule either. So how 16 are we going to solve that 17 problem? The pro se --18 COMMITTEE MEMBER: (Inaudible) in small claims court 19 20 now. Ninety-nine percent of them 21 are pro se. 22 COMMITTEE MEMBER: So do 23 we give the prose the exception 24 you're talking about?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I don't

think so, but that's a decision for us to make.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SMITH: Outside the scope of domestic violence -- I'll keep that -- I'll pound that drum again. But the -- I mean, I think that the pro se litigant wishing to file a divorce and being told, You need to go fill out this form and attach some documentation, then the problem would not be onerous because time is not particularly of the essence. If it takes another week to get back to the court with the information, it's probably not a whole lot of loss. Other than a domestic violence case, which again --But, I mean, I guess I would have some slight concern with the defendant who shows up to file his answer on day thirty and is told, you have got to have all these things (inaudible). Again, it's probably not the most

onerous thing in the world. might be nice for the defendant to receive something with the summons telling him he had to do this. I don't know. Attach more stuff to the summons telling people more, giving people more information. But that would certainly at least put the defendant on notice not only do you have to file an answer, but you have to file this other documentation, also.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well, we have a new rule that the committee didn't have anything to do with. I don't know who wrote it, but it's 32.1 that instigated another form that every parent is supposed to file in a divorce action. Maybe you could add that wording to that form.

JUDGE GOSA: Thank you, sir.

MR. SMITH: Thank you very much.

,

JUDGE GOSA: Thomas French?

THOMAS FRENCH: I'm Thomas

French. I'm from Scottsboro.

That's Jackson County. If there

was a prize for the furtherest

travel, I would probably get it.

I have three concerns about

Rule 32. The first concern is in

reference to self-employment

income. The definition of gross

income is as follows: Gross

receipts minus ordinary and

necessary expenses required to

produce such income.

Jackson County courts tend to use federal income tax returns to establish this income figure. The small business owner incurs much cost that will end up as profit on a tax return but does not amount to money in their checkbook.

When a small business owner borrows money from the bank, the -- this is not applied as income to him though when the business

repays the money, whether it's in a single payment or monthly payments, then these payments to principal are not deductible and ultimately end up as profit. business purchases a piece of equipment and finances it for five years and makes the monthly payments, then the payment on the principal will become profit. This means that if a business is heavy in debt but is able to make the payments, then they can be broke and still have a profit.

The courts do not have or take time to take testimony on each item that a business needs. A truck that you are making payments on will most likely end up with little or no value in five years. Many equipment purchases are for specific needs and may have no value to the company after the chosen job is complete.

I do understand that there is

depreciation. I realize the
business will have the truck, the
equipment, et cetera, after it's
paid for. But more times than
not, it has little or no value, and
if they choose to sell the item,
then the proceeds will become
profit.

I was paid up front by a corporate customer about a hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars to purchase a specific piece of equipment. In turn, I received an order to produce the parts. Four months after the purchase, 9-11 occurred. The customer basically stopped the project. I ended up with a machine that had no value. Sold it for forty-five hundred dollars at auction.

As a result of this, I had a huge profit for that tax year.

The following year, I was out of (unintelligible) based on those

profit figures.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Rule encourages bad decisions on businesses. You can lease a truck. It's a hundred percent deductible. The same holds true for rented buildings and/or leased equipment. Most small business owners operate on a shoestring. If they make bad decisions in order to stay alive, it ends up costing everyone. A truck payment, a building payment, and equipment payment ends up costing thirty percent more after you factor in child support enforcing bad decisions on business owners. It's not an effort to avoid child support, but it simply becomes a mission to stay alive.

The profit as stated on the tax returns will also include any money in the checking account.

If you have a balance of twenty thousand dollars, it will end up

as profit. The small business must have operating funds to operate on to survive. This balance may be carried from year to year, but it continues to be taxed by Rule 32 every year. And when the operating funds are depleted, then you have business failure.

The same Rule applies to someone who is regularly employed. It would mean the following: Let's see your W-2. Let's see your checkbook. And you can't even think about being employed (unintelligible) support payments.

What is the solution? A
better definition of ordinary and
necessary business expenses.
Using income tax returns as a
baseline is a good starting point,
but there must be a specific
provision in place to allow for
real and viable business

expenses. A small business worksheet that's completed by a CPA outside of the courtroom on behalf of a small business would be very helpful. This worksheet would have the tax return profit as a starting figure and then take into consideration the necessary expenses not allowed by the IRS. This chart would include such items as principal payments, tax penalties, (unintelligible), overdraft charges, carryover cash balances, et cetera.

Most small business owners support their children with pride.

Most courts will not take the time to discover the true income, and as a result, the small business owners end up with cash-flow problems and at the first slow period normally never recover.

The second item is sort of touching on what Tim did on the excessive visitation. We all

know that there's not a standard visitation schedule, and my concern is when there is a standard visitation schedule, because there's not a set amount of reduction, that the courts will never order any excessive visitation in order to not have to fight the problem of the money. You know, if you said a half a percent per day or something, it would make it real easy for the court to give the noncustodial more visitation.

The court system is overloaded. When there's been a drastic change in income, there has to be a system in place to adjust the support payment. Back to Mr. Harbin. If it takes you fifteen months to have a hearing and you become so deep in arrearages, then it's certain to cause financial ruin. A small business may have a great year,

306 1 then a terrible one. Adjustments 2 must be made promptly in order 3 for justice to be served. 4 Thank you. 5 JUDGE GOSA: Any questions? 6 Thank you. Stanley Truitt? STANLEY TRUITT: 8 M y 9 comments are that I feel that the 10 guidelines, current state 11 guidelines, I think they're fair, 12 and I think they're unbiased. 13 And I think -- I have read through them, and I feel like 14 15 there was a lot of time put into 16 them, a lot of thinking, a lot of

> I have an engineering degree, and to put those documents -- for us to put them together would probably cost about fifty thousand dollars. It may have cost the state four times that.

money.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And my comments are that I just feel like the judges should follow the guidelines. If they
follow the current state
guidelines, I think it would save
a lot of cases in the federal
courts and a lot of hard feelings.

And this is from my personal experience. It really hurt me to find out years later that I'm paying almost three times what the state called for. That really hurt me, and I feel like it caused a reduction in my life unnecessarily.

And when I looked at it, when I really looked at the guidelines, like -- as I say, I thought they were reasonable. I thought they were reasonable and that they didn't put an undue burden upon anyone. You know, while I was reading the paper, what the state calls for for two kids, I was paying that eight years ago at the same time.

So -- But it's just my

statement that I feel like what
the state has already put down,
that's what judges should be
required to follow. And I think
it will save a lot of heartache
and pain for a lot of people.

And that's about all I have. I didn't really have a whole lot to say. (Unintelligible.) Like I said, it really hurt me because I used to stay in an apartment (unintelligible). You know, I really didn't start putting anything together until I was able to reduce my debt, and that's how I put my life together.

As I said, it really hurt me because the fact that I stood before this judge, and I felt that he was fair. I felt that he was fair, and I felt that what was going on was the right thing.

And it really hurt years later to

find out that he did not do what

(Unintelligible) turned around.

he was supposed to do, and it just really hurt me and made me angry.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE MEMBER: What county are you from?

MR. TRUITT: I'm originally from Jefferson County.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Where did you get your divorce?

MR. TRUITT: Jefferson County. I did it myself because I had lost, like, about sixteen hundred dollar trying to find a lawyer to do the right thing, and they wouldn't. So I decided to take it on myself. And I looked up to the judge to be fair because I wasn't a criminal. I hadn't done anything wrong, and I felt like he would protect me. And it just flipped me out years later when I happened to be going through the internet, and I ran across the website for this building. And it's a very helpful website, tremendous amount of

```
1
      information. And that's when I
      started finding out stuff. You
2
      know, I can't believe this. I
3
      can't believe this is going on.
4
5
      And there are people out there --
6
      I've got a friend, one of the guys
      that I supervise (inaudible) he's
8
      paying a thousand dollars a month
9
      child support, and he works odd
10
      jobs. He works Saturdays.
11
      (Inaudible) a friend of mine, he
12
      said, You see that house right
13
      there (inaudible). We call him
            He said, That used to be
14
      Joe.
15
      Joe's house. He lost it. You
16
      know, and it just -- And I told
17
      him, I said, With what you're
18
      paying, you might as well
      (inaudible). You can't even live
19
20
      from day to day.
21
          Yes, sir?
22
          COMMITTEE MEMBER:
                                  H o w
23
      (inaudible)?
24
          MR. TRUITT: He just picked
```

it out of the air. That's what

1 upset me. I thought --2 COMMITTEE MEMBER: This 3 was eight years ago? MR. TRUITT: Pardon me? 4 COMMITTEE MEMBER: This 5 6 was eight years ago? 7 MR. TRUITT: Yeah, they just 8 picked it out of the air. What it 9 was, it was done wrong. I found 10 out -- After I got ahold of this 11 website, I found out a lot of 12 information. It was done wrong. 13 I felt like appealing, but I told 14 my brother, I looked at things 15 that -- I looked at the whole 16 picture. And I said, Our appeals court is overloaded. There are 17 18 people that have got their lives on the line. They are facing the 19 20 death penalty. Those are the 21 cases the court needs to be 22 handling. I won't die. My son 23 will grow up one day, and it will

COMMITTEE MEMBER:

be all over.

24

(Inaudible.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Have you talked to an attorney about going back to court to revisit this?

MR. TRUITT: It has really been a mess because, you know, I want to stay focused because there are some other things that my ex has done, too, because, like, every time I've made the jump financially, I'll get knocked back. I finally paid all the bills off, bought a house in Alabaster. And I came and told her, said, Hey, you know, I can't use my VA benefits. You've got that tied up. I can't use FHA because they wanted twelve checks from you. I can't get it. The lady says we can go conventional, but it will cost you an arm and a leg. I said, I'm going to be late with this child support payment. Is it okay. No. I said, Come on, help

1 me out. No. So I was, like, 2 fifteen days late. They had me in 3 court. It just so happened that I was lucky enough that I hadn't 4 thrown out all my papers because 5 6 I had all my child support checks that I had sent to her from day 8 one. And also, I had paid for my 9 son to play baseball. Paid for 10 him to buy his candy when it was 11 for sale. The guy garnisheed my 12 pay, and it sent me into a 13 tailspin. So what I did, I started 14 looking for another job. I got an 15 opportunity to come here and 16 work. So I took another job 17 making a little more money, and a 18 lot of things worked out. And I told my brother I was so mad 19 20 because (inaudible) and then I 21 was in court again. And this 22 time, I said, Man, they raked me 23 over the coals.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: You

didn't answer his question.

24

1	MR. TRUITT: Huh?
2	COMMITTEE MEMBER: You
3	didn't answer his question.
4	MR. TRUITT: Oh, I'm sorry.
5	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Have
6	you consulted an attorney?
7	MR. TRUITT: No, sir.
8	COMMITTEE MEMBER: You
9	have one child from this
10	marriage?
11	MR. TRUITT: Yeah, I pay in
12	total I added it up yes, sir,
13	one child.
14	COMMITTEE MEMBER: What's
15	your monthly payment?
16	MR. TRUITT: I pay out of my
17	pocket four forty twenty-five, if
18	I remember right, and I pay for
19	his health insurance, dental
20	insurance. And, also, I've got a
21	2003 Acura that's got eighty
22	thousand miles on it because I
23	promised him I would come pick
24	him up every weekend. I drive
25	all the way to Birmingham and

1	back. And when I was reading the
2	website for this location, I
3	didn't know that if you take it on
4	a burden if you take the burden
5	to go pick your child up, they
6	will adjust the child support. I
7	know the time is up. I just
8	wanted to make sure (inaudible).
9	JUDGE GOSA: Let me go back
10	and make sure. Joyce Gardner-
11	Thomas was a no show. I know
12	Rhonda Kelley is. She called and
13	was hospitalized. Marcia Poe is
14	a no show.
15	Anything from the committee
16	before we adjourn until 9:00
17	tomorrow?
18	I'm sorry. We have another
19	one. No she cancelled. I'm
20	sorry. Carol Gundlach cancelled.
21	(Whereupon, the Public
22	Hearing was adjourned.)
23	• * * * *

STATE OF ALABAMA

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CHILD

SUPPORT GUIDELINES AND

ENFORCEMENT

MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA

IN RE: CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINES

PUBLIC HEARING

March 11, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION OF REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT

I, Laura A. Head, Court
Reporter for the State of Alabama
at Large, do hereby certify that I
have this date completed a true
and correct transcription to the
best of my ability from
videotapes of the public hearing
held in the above-styled cause
had and done before the Advisory
Committee on Child Support
Guidelines and Enforcement,
Alabama Judicial Building, 300

Dexter Avenue, Montgomery,
Alabama, on Thursday, March
11th, 2004. All pages are
numbered serially with the
numbers appearing in the top
right-hand corner of each page,
and the transcript ends with the
number appearing at the top of
this Certificate.

DATED this 7th day of April, 2005.

Court Reporter